





Yours faithfully  
G. Wilson



# TRUTHS AS I HAVE SEEN THEM

BEING

Addresses on the Spiritual Life

BY

GEORGE W. WILSON

AUTHOR OF "GET RIGHT WITH GOD," "SPARKS AS THE HAMMER STRUCK THEM,"  
AND "EVANGELISM AND EVANGELISTIC WORK."

INTRODUCTION BY

REV. DANIEL STEELE, D.D.

*"Hitherto the bone of contention has been theory, hereafter let it be TRUTH."*

---

BOSTON

THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS COMPANY

1897

**COPYRIGHT, 1897,**  
**BY GEORGE W. WILSON.**

**TYPOGRAPHY BY C. J. PETERS & SON, BOSTON.**  

---

**PRESSWORK BY SKINNER, BARTLETT & CO.**

# Affectionately Dedicated

TO

MY COMPANION IN SERVICE AND SACRIFICE,

MY SONS AND DAUGHTERS,

TO

THE MANY WHO HAVE REQUESTED TO HAVE THESE THOUGHTS

IN A MORE PERMANENT FORM,

AND TO

THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH,

WHO MAY BE AIDED IN ANY DEGREE BY PERUSING

THESE PAGES.



## PREFACE.

---

ANOTHER book on the ever-living themes of gospel truth. Why? Because the author proclaiming the truths herein declared, has been earnestly requested to leave them in a more permanent form. If they should be half as helpful when written, as when delivered in the fervor of the spirit, it will be sufficient excuse for publishing them. The writer lays no claim to originality, and can only ask a place among the many, by virtue of his type of expressing known truth. Some of the perplexing questions of to-day have been set at rest in his own mind, and many have been helped as these truths have been unfolded. It is in the hope that others may gain the same liberty, and see the fulness there is in Christ Jesus, that he pens these words. He makes no claim to literary achievement. The writer is not seeking cold logic, but living truth plainly stated. As to defects, they will be found in abundance for those who seek them. May the blood of Jesus enswathe us all in its purity; the love of God fire every faculty to its intensest heat, and the Holy Spirit transform us into the divine image.

G. W. WILSON.

81 PROVIDENCE STREET, PROVIDENCE, R.I.



## INTRODUCTION.

---

BEFORE Pilate Jesus said, "To this end was I born, that I should bear witness unto the truth." This implies that we live in a world which greatly needs the truth, and that the truth is established, diffused, and maintained by competent witnesses. Jesus was such a witness. He had the unique qualification of identity with the truth. He was the only man of Adam's race who could say, "I am the truth." He calls every one born into his kingdom to follow his example, to do essentially the same work. In his high-priestly prayer he says, "I have given them thy word. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." The incarnation was a veil in which Divinity dwelt, receiving the words of the Father on one side, and handing them out to men on the other side. These words are to be so incorporated into our lives, so identified with us by an inward experience and transfiguration, as to qualify us to re-present them to the whole human family. The truth to which Christ bore witness had this peculiarity,—it was the only remedy for the world's spiritual maladies, and was distasteful to all depraved hearts. It has always required heroism to stand up and proclaim unaccepted and unpopular truth, the moral ruin

of man, and the efficacy of Christ's blood to save from the guilt of sin, the love of sin, and the pollution and inbeing of sin, here and now, through an all-surrendering faith in our adorable Saviour, without doing or suffering anything more. This doctrine of entire sanctification, the gate to Christian perfection this side of the grave, has always encountered opposition, and it is always raising up more and more intelligent and valiant advocates to restate and defend it against all comers. This is indeed encouraging, and specially gratifying to the veterans who are laying aside the harness, and are sitting in the door of the tent to see younger soldiers fight under the same flag.

There can never be too many books written on the highest possibilities of grace in bringing believers into evangelical perfection. Every book benefits its author, his circle of friends, and if written from a glowing Christian experience, it will minister instruction and inspiration to inquiring souls in all lands. This book, which I am happy to have the honor of introducing to the religious public, is a condensed presentation of sermons, evidently written according to the advice given to the students of the Lane Theological Seminary by Dr. Lyman Beecher: "Students, pump yourselves full of the subject, knock out the bung, and let Nature caper." The reader will find something superior to rhetorical excitement in this book. He will find indelible proofs of the unction of the Holy Ghost. Books written under the promptings of this indefinable, melting, suasive power are fittest to survive. They satisfy the cravings of successive gen-

erations long after the fascinating address to the imagination has found its grave on the top shelf in the neglected alcove.

A glance at the Table of Contents will show a wide range of live topics. Such themes as "Witnessing to Your Faith" and "Divine Healing" are especially timely, considering the mischievous practical errors with which these subjects are disfigured at the present hour.

The discussion of "The Relation of the Senses, Appetites, and Desires to Holiness" throws much light on a topic which very much needed vindication against extreme opposite views which would put the standard of holiness so high as to drive it out of the world, or so low as to palliate sin under the name of infirmity.

In conclusion, I predict that this book will be a blessing to every candid reader who "is of the truth;" that is, who aspires to know the truth, and to follow whithersoever she may lead. The writer makes this prediction because he finds the hours spent with the proof-sheets to be a season of delightful communion of the Holy Spirit. Truths which are good electric conductors from heaven to me, will not fail to be the media of great grace to others.

DANIEL STEELE.

MILTON, *June 26, 1897.*

# CONTENTS.

---

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. SIN. — ITS NATURE . . . . .	11
II. SIN'S ONLY REMEDY . . . . .	29
III. REGENERATION . . . . .	36
IV. HOLINESS . . . . .	48
V. THE TWO EXPERIENCES CONTRASTED . . . . .	56
VI. THE BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY GHOST . . . . .	69
VII. CRUCIFIXION WITH CHRIST . . . . .	78
VIII. RIGHTEOUSNESS UP TO THE STANDARD OF THE LAW . . . . .	91
IX. THE WAY OF FAITH . . . . .	102
X. INFIRMITIES <i>vs.</i> SINS . . . . .	115
XI. LOVE THE SPIRIT OF OUR RELIGION . . . . .	124
XII. LIKENESS UNTO HIMSELF BY CONFORMITY TO HIS IMAGE, . . . . .	137
XIII. DIVINE HEALING . . . . .	159
XIV. CHRISTIAN PERFECTION . . . . .	180
XV. THE RELATION OF THE SENSES, APPETITES, AND DE- SIRE TO HOLINESS . . . . .	192
XVI. DIVINE USE FOR SUFFERING . . . . .	204
XVII. WHAT GIFTS REMAIN SINCE PENTECOST? . . . . .	214
XVIII. CROSSES, WITHIN, — WITHOUT . . . . .	231
XIX. THE SELF LIFE . . . . .	240
XX. WHAT I KNOW ABOUT IT PERSONALLY . . . . .	249



# TRUTHS AS I HAVE SEEN THEM.

---

## I.

### SIN.—ITS NATURE.

They themselves decreed  
Their own revolt, not I.

MILTON.

Then lust when it hath conceived bringeth forth sin. — JAMES.

The involuntary excites sympathy ; the voluntary, approval or condemnation as it embraces right or wrong. — J. W. MENDENHALL, D.D.

Original sin is the vanishment of the conception of God from men's minds. — THOMAS CARLYLE.

PERHAPS no subject has aroused more thought, or calls for clearer Scriptural definition, than the one of sin. Several doctrines are taught concerning it. One is, that it is inherent in matter, and is co-eternal with good, — the doctrine of the pantheistic East. Another theory is, that it was a predetermined purpose of God that it should exist, and that it is a thought co-eternal with himself, as a means of unfolding the scheme of redemption. The first of these theories I need not refute ; and the second, though seemingly more plausible, is equally fallacious. If sin is necessary to develop a scheme like the gospel, it must be an indirect good, as

an agency in the hands of God for such a glorious purpose. To place God in such a relation is to limit his resources, and contradict facts; as every candid observer knows, no good can come of any evil.

If sin has always existed, there can be no responsibility for its existence; and to build a foundation of moral responsibility on a necessity would be impossible. If it has not existed eternally, some cause must have originated it. To charge God as its author, and then punish the creature for its manifestations, would be subversive to a righteous government. God's holiness precludes a possibility to sin, or to originate it. The nature that introduces sin into the universe must deprave itself in doing so. No being under the law of necessity could introduce it. Nothing perfect could originate it without the self-determinations of a free being. In a perfect universe sin could not enter as an evolution of organic pre-existing causes. Nature cannot disturb its own established laws. Law must be acted upon adversely before sin can exist; it ceases to exist when perverse action upon righteous law ends. A blind somewhat, incapable of discerning law, could not create it; for that somewhat would be under the law of necessity itself, and non-freedom precludes sin. If God created it, it has a harmonious relation to every other perfect thing in his universe. The facts do not warrant such a theory. If sin is a necessary thing, it can have no moral quality; if unnecessary, it must come

under the domain of possibility; and if a possibility, it must come into being under law, without disturbing the unity of things, or exist as an antagonism to law, setting up hitherto non-existing disturbances. If only a possibility, there must have been a period when it was a nonentity, which destroys necessity. If only a possibility, it could not, and might not, have been.

Revelation teaches that angels sinned before man was created, and lost their first estate; others remained sinless, and are preserved in original purity. How sin was introduced, it does not declare. None but free beings could introduce it; whoever did must have had ability to transgress law, for "sin is a transgression of the law." Its existence antedates human history; and as salvation alone is procured for the human race, it could not be that God would destroy angelic nature for means to procure a blessing for human nature. Angels, not being related by procreation, could not impart conditions of sin; and if they fell, they did so individually. One may have led the way; but we must not confound Milton and revelation. Any being under the law of necessity, or even constraint, could not originate sin; such beings could only automatically conform to prescribed law: give such beings liberty, and what added power they possess! Perhaps the first discovery made is, the ability to determine otherwise than prescribed law dictates. With the consciousness of relating one's self to law by choice, and not necessity, comes merit or de-



merit. Limitation without added possibility gives no room for liberty ; nor will mere increasing capacity to conform to higher law. To be according to law may sustain undisturbed one's created relations, but it suggests no possibilities. Something more must be possible than constant obedience to prescribed law where freedom exists. All free beings feel this possibility intuitively. Ability to conform to "the righteousness of the law" is not freedom without ability to violate it. No spirit-nature would be complete without this ability ; and such ability must be under the sole determinations of the being who possesses it if responsibility is complete, else any outside determinations would become constraints in proportion to their potency, unless conflicting determinations counteracted them.

The feeling that conformity to law is right, is not liberty ; a conception of a harmonious relation may exist with a determination to overthrow it. If only what is right is possible, right cannot have any virtue in it ; and the thought of right is under the law of necessity until the opposite is possible. We endanger the whole system of truth when we infringe upon the law of liberty. Calvinian necessity has produced Unitarian lawlessness. A perfect spirit could have nothing outside of itself in a sinless, perfect universe to induce it to sin ; nothing outside could suggest nonconformity to law, or unrighteousness. It could not be in God or other perfect spirits, and nature has no such causes. Sin must

begin in a perfect nature determining to use its liberty other than divine law requires. Why a perfect being would do thus, I cannot answer ; perhaps eternity alone will reveal. Even now, though fallen from past possibilities, we feel this freedom assert itself. This is our test, this our temptation ; no doubt this was Christ's temptation, and made it possible for sin to be introduced into his human nature. To be perfect, and yet limited, and free, makes it possible to step beyond limits. If temptation implies power to the contrary of what is right, then temptation may exist in the discovery of the ability to do wrong. Dr. Whedon says, "The free volitional power to sin, so far from being a defect, an impurity, an imperfection, implies and *is* a high quality. Not only may it be possessed by a being perfectly pure, but it must be primordially possessed by a being meritoriously pure." This is man's sovereignty, not to create good, but to choose evil. Some free being chose to create evil, and destroy his freedom. As Milton, speaking for God, says, —

"I ordained their freedom,  
They themselves ordained their fall."

Selfhood must be disturbed before sin can be manifest.

The inspired record gives us sufficient light for all practical purposes concerning the question of sin. If we cannot divine how it originated among the angels, we know temptation to man came from pre-existing evil

without. All spirit-nature has the capacity to know the mind of the Creator, and communicate with all other created intelligences. Why one spirit alone is represented introducing the temptation I cannot tell; many had fallen. What difference need it make to us, if test is essential to meritorious purity, what cause suggests temptation? the final act producing sin, in every case is self-caused.

Man as a new creation, being free, though not the first who sinned, *sinned for himself and of himself*: the determination was original; no doubt a possibility to determine otherwise was implied in his freedom. On account of the Fall we have lost the ability to discern the moral qualities of our nature and God's truth concerning sin: therefore he has sent his Spirit into the world "to convince of sin," to distinguish between the results of sin, and sin itself; between an act expressing it, and the sin expressed; between human nature that is polluted by its presence, and the pollution that taints it; between the immaterial, vital thing called sin, and a spirit-being it impinges upon and operates through.

Much of the controversy on this question would not have existed if we had followed the light of the Spirit that "convinces of sin," and the testimony of our own consciousness. There can be no conviction of sin unless the one convinced is *in* sin, and his nature attests the truthfulness of the Spirit's claim. Neither can there be a conviction of pollution without a revelation in con-

sciousness of the existing pollution. No act itself can be sin. As no act in itself is sinful, the nature of the actor must enter into it to give it moral quality ; on the other hand, a sinful nature may exist without any manifestation in action : this consciousness clearly attests. Sin in nature precedes self-consciousness, and is frequently found positively asserting itself before the will makes any determinations concerning it.

The Scriptures give at least five definitions of sin : —

*First.* — “All unrighteousness is sin.” — *I John* v. 17.

*Second.* — “He that committeth sin is of the devil.” — *I John* iii. 8.

*Third.* — “Sin is a transgression of the law.” — *I John* iii. 4.

*Fourth.* — “To him, therefore, that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.” — *James* iv. 17.

*Fifth.* — “In sin did my mother conceive me.” — *Ps.* li. 5.

“All unrighteousness [unrightness] is sin.” This certainly must refer to that part of being capable of sin. At once we exclude the physical : the effect of sin may manifest itself in our physical life, but no perversity of the physical can produce sin ; indeed, a high type of physical life is compatible with a very depraved spirit-nature, as we frequently see. Obedience to physical laws brings a good degree of blessing when the end sought is to serve a vicious spirit. Nor is the mental nature implied here. Great mental endowment with low

character, and holy living with the minimum of mental gifts, are quite common. The mental nature can no more produce sin than it can evolve spirit. Nor can mere volition produce sin without a spirit-nature upon which volitions operate, and receive the impress of the character of its determinations. As the will does not think, neither does it sin ; but it determines that sin shall exist, and manifest itself in spirit-nature. Childhood has spirit-nature previous to any volitions, the moral nature of which is manifest through involuntary actions before any determinations are made, or long before it is conscious of possessing any impurity of nature. Previous to thinking, it feels impinging upon it an unright thing, the nature of which is discerned by those who have learned by experience to discern between physical and mental weaknesses, and sin dwelling in us.

Unrighteousness has a twofold method of measurement,—a law standard, and a conscious wrongness. There is only one law of right ; viz., Godlikeness. Ungodlike spirit-nature must be a product or creation. If God made man under a less standard than governs his own nature, he could not have made him in “his own image.” How foolish to think a few rules, washings, sacrifices, etc., are standards to govern a spirit-nature ! A spirit lacking in the moral pureness of God is unrighteous, and comes under law, and is by it declared unrighteous. Remember, spirit is not capable of any

other quality than pure and impure. Where there is any lack in moral quality, there sin is present, and not weakness merely. The law governing our spirits is the standard of rightness in Himself: being absolute and self-sufficient does not increase the moral quality of his own spirit; being infinite in his attributes does not add anything to the moral nature he possesses, and any other basis of oneness with himself would be forced and unnatural. Consequently, we have no gradations in purity; to not be pure "as he is pure" is to possess something antithetical to purity, and the only antithesis to purity is sin. The testimony of our consciousness to an existing wrongness corroborates the law of God. Every heart in which sin dwells is more or less conscious of its movements. *The only method by which it can determine its real nature is by our sense of its impurity, or uncleanness.* The method by which we distinguish it from temptation is a self-likeness to its moral character. Where sin is, I lack Godlikeness. That I can be Godlike, and tempted to all forms of sin, Jesus witnesseth. For spirit-nature there is nothing after righteousness but continuance in the same. There can be no righteousness while sin remains. It is not a weakness to be regretted, but an impurity to be purged away. Conscience does not charge us with impurity on the discovery of weakness, nor does it call unrighteousness weakness, but proves God's word true, "All unrighteousness is sin."

We measure our standing before divine law by the state of our natures, and not by any form of action. The presence of a living thing defiling our being is the testimony of consciousness. We know it is not us. We know it is not God; for it is "enmity against God, not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Being impersonal, it is not the presence of another being. It is not thought, because its movement antedates our thinking, and arrests our thought. We do not choose it; it has been the instigation of all our wrong acts. Can we find a better expression than Paul gave when he said, "It is no more I, but sin that dwelleth in me"? "the body of sin" having vitality to be crucified, and thereby "destroyed," and yet, because it is not *I*, capable of utter destruction. Paul shows it is not the product of his volitions, and cannot be destroyed by them; it antedates his determinations, and is contrary to them. "For that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that I do not, but what I hate, that I do." Here he declares that his selfhood (inner man) approves the will of God, but sin, working in him all manner of concupiscence, slays him.

Here is the fundamental fact for cleansing. Some are seeking to substitute "empowering" for cleansing. This is only half truth, and exceedingly dangerous teaching. No doubt the being paralyzed by sin needs empowering, but sin must first be cleansed before empowering is possible. *Sin nullifies all possible empowering*; as well hope

to make a sick man well by tonic while the malady remains. When the church urges cleansing, it will be in harmony with spiritual science, and empowering will follow: the opposite has never been realized in its history. There is no possible "power to become the sons of God" until sinful choices are abandoned, and pardon for the past secured; nor is there any possible "power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you" until the sin that dwelleth in you is cleansed away. Putting away and confessing of sin must precede sonship; cleansing from all unrighteousness must precede being filled with the Holy Ghost. A fit of anger in a child is not the result of a determination on its part to become angry. It feels the anger producing uneasiness, and asserts it without regard to its moral character. When pride and lust assert themselves in an unclean heart, we never think of calling them "guilty transgressions of law; such transgressions as the transgressor knew he could, and therefore should, have avoided." Leopard-like, they spring unexpected and unbidden from their lair, and fasten on the soul, producing fearful conflict. Can one avoid an involuntary thing transpiring? Can one feel guilty for an involuntary state? and yet no well-instructed soul would question their moral turpitude. Words are but forms to express our states of consciousness; and through all time sin and its synonyms have been used to express those states. Empowering is not the remedy for sin; it is blood, not spirit; it is cleansing, not filling.



The blood stands forth as God's remedy for sin, the Holy Spirit as the renewer and sanctifier. If our experiences can be proven unreal, then we have no common ground of unity; or if the testimony of consciousness in one case denies the testimony of consciousness in another, then what is true to one may be false to another, what is love to one may be hate to another, and what is good to one may be bad to another. The consensus of testimony is against the theory that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all unrighteousness in connection with the generating act of the new birth.

"He that committeth sin is of the devil." Here the *act* is emphasized, — "*committeth*." Practice in sin is here implied; and this cannot be until the nature is corrupted, and under the dominion of Satan. In this case the will of the individual goes over to the commission of the act, and guilt and condemnation ensue. There could be no condemnation for an involuntary state, however loathsome. Condemnation can only ensue when the soul has related itself consentingly to the existence of wrong. This, of course, occurs when the choice is made, though the wrong may never be enacted. To look at uncleanness may arouse compassion in a pure heart, while a consenting unclean look brings defilement and condemnation. Determinate unholy choice is abundant proof that the individual is under the dominion of Satan.

"Sin is a transgression of the law;" however, not

every transgression of law is sin. Involuntary action from many causes may be violation of law; but no sin follows, nor is it directly caused by sin, because the spirit-nature had no expression in the case, and no liberty existed, therefore no determinations were made: but sin cannot exist without transgressing God's moral law. He "that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Simply to fail to perform an act, however good its performance might be, is not sin. One might know it ought to be performed, and lack the ability to perform it. It must be the omission of a known obligation with ability to perform it, or it would not be obligatory. There may be disastrous results from violating unknown law; but "where no law is, there is no transgression." To be ignorant of a spirit law precludes a spiritual transgression. When we discover what is right, and have the ability to obey available, our obligation begins. Right clearly implied is as binding upon us as an explicit command; and customs, habits, social conditions, or false theologies count for nothing before the obligation. To know to do good, from whatever source the knowledge comes, and not to do it, is sin dominant, active, involving a clear commitment of one's self to wrong by preference; an act of sin "revealing the [old] man of sin." Inability to perform good is not sin until proffered ability is rejected.

*"In sin did my mother conceive me."* Our limited knowledge of pre-natal influences makes it hard to

elucidate what is taught here ; however, non-ability to explain the philosophy of some facts does not exclude them from the realm of truth. The question of the times is, What is transmitted by procreation, and what destroyed by the process of salvation? We can only approach toward a solution of this great problem, and then witness to conscious states. Those who reject the doctrine of transmitted sin, teach that this passage declares that the *act* by which David was conceived was an act of sin, and not one of transmitting it. If the actors in his begetting *committed* sin, they must have been sinful before the act ; and how, true to the doctrine of hereditary taint, he partook of the same sin himself. If that theory is true, it only makes the case all the stronger for imparted sin. If he was conceived by an act of lust, he discovered a lustful nature in him. This theory only brings the cause more direct ; we teach possible remote causes.

*Is sin itself procreated?* There is no controversy worth mentioning as to whether the consequences of sin are procreated ; a calm investigation of types clearly shows that. If we believed, as some, that God creates each individual spirit, we would be relieved of this difficulty ; for he could not create an impure spirit : but if this were true, in the most vital sense we would not be the offspring of Adam. Others teach we are emanations of God. In either case, the difficulty of a fact remains in the discovery of sin manifest before the in-

dividual possessing it could have originated it. I am not unapprised of the recent endeavor to establish the doctrine that spirits are begotten pure. I can readily admit they are *innocent*, but the facts disprove they are pure. The body of theologians teach a lapsed state of nature, of which depraved appetites and passions are an expression. But how has the lapse come? and what is the moral and spiritual state of a lapsed spirit? “Carnal” is the word used by Paul. A state of nature when the inspiring life of God leaves the being, and it becomes self-centred, producing opposite moral qualities from “the righteousness of God;” and this righteousness, the opposite of “all unrighteousness,” is not obtainable otherwise than as the gift of God. We procreate spirit-nature,—lapsed spirit-nature; and no amount of spiritualization bestows the power to procreate the spirit that quickens. The first Adam’s highest prerogative since the Fall is to beget a living soul, and by *nature* all his offspring are “the children of wrath.” The atonement through blood cleanses the defilement arising from a lapsed spirit-nature, the Spirit imparts life to the cleansed lapsed nature, and gives it a fulness that sets up transformations that exalt the type, as the opposite intensifies its degradation. *As there is no natural sanctification, there cannot be a procreated sanctification.* It is not a state wrought in nature merely, but a state the product of the whole nature being filled with the Spirit of God, purity only lasting

while the Spirit fills. We procreate our selfhood independent of agencies operating upon us, else we would beget offspring in the highest states of grace, provided we were in them ourselves at the time we beget the offspring. *There is no natural purity or holiness.* Spirit-life may be natural, but spiritual life is divine and supernatural. Our offspring receive immortal life from us, but not eternal life; "the gift of God is eternal life;" and no other life can quicken a lapsed spirit, and no other kind can conform to the law of righteousness. While we impart every attribute of human nature, we cannot impart the spiritual life to transform it from a lapsed estate into fulness, though the human type is greatly enhanced through continued righteousness. Carlyle said Darwin was the third generation of atheists, being personally acquainted with them. Paul predicated much on Timothy "having been reminded of the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice. For which cause I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God." The purifying and filling of the spirit being under the law of grace, this purity and infilling lapsed nature may be immediate, while mental and physical life, operating under different laws, may manifest great deficiency. A diseased body and meagre mental endowment are frequently attached to a pure spirit, while a great inheritance of both may be dominated by a vicious spirit. It is not possible to in-

stantly lose a high mental endowment, any more than it is possible to instantly secure it ; but it is possible to instantly pollute the purest spirit, or to be instantly restored to purity.

That children come into the world in this lapsed condition every observing mother knows. Of course we can only discern the moral quality of another spirit by discerning in them that which manifests certain moral qualities in ourselves. Does not every mother distinguish between the cry that pain produces and the one expressive of anger? She seeks to remove the cause of the first ; she seeks to allay the other, the character of which she too well knows. She expects to remove the pain ; she never dreams of removing the temper. She does not say the cry of pain is wrong ; she is pained over the uncontrolled temper, and calls the child's attention to a remedy and cure outside the natural. To deny this premise of sin in nature, he who denies it must not only establish the fact that his own consciousness denies such claims, but that the testimony of other witnesses is false ; for we are not dealing with processes of reasoning, but states of consciousness. What made Paul say, "It is no more *I*, but *sin* that dwelleth in me" ? These states of consciousness exist.

I do not yield to unholy desires, therefore no guilt exists. I do not desire the impure feelings that express themselves inwardly through the various attributes of my being, seeking outward expression, especially when

something of the same moral character is presented from without.

I am conscious of a new life, that dominates the old nature, and controls its manifestations.

I have a feeling of loathing the old desires, and a conviction that the atonement has provided for inward purity.

Why feel polluted if the difficulty is merely "disarrangement"? Can there be any other disarrangement in spirit-nature but from pure to impure?

Unpleasant theme! I recall some of its history. I shudder at the record, and find Nature's voices hushed as I ask plaintively for a cure. Listen: "Thanks be unto God, who giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord."

In a succeeding chapter I will specify the REMEDY.

## II.

## SIN'S ONLY REMEDY.

The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from sin. — *1 John* i. 7.

All my griefs, I can better and better see, lie in a good measure at my own door; were I right in MY OWN HEART, nothing else would be far wrong with me. *Life of Carlyle*, vol. ii., p. 368.

The preservation of his personality from moral taint is man's first duty. — REV. A. J. FRENCH, B.A., MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.

He [Jesus] was the first to insist that the one bondage a man need fear was sin; that no man need be the slave of sin unless he willed; that freedom from sin was perfect liberty, and that any man could enter into heaven by retiring within a clean and loving soul. — IAN MACLAREN.

WHEN Henry Ward Beecher said, "That thought of blood never did me the least good in the world. The idea of blood is not to my taste; it pertains to the old sacrifices. I do not like that text," the keynote of sin's remedy was hushed in the ears of his listeners, and heaven's song was almost blasphemously spoken against; for John heard the redeemed in heaven sing, "Unto him who hath loved us, and loosed us from our sins in his own blood," showing that among the glorified, the text Mr. Beecher did not like was the one that made heaven ring with hosannas. With thousands of the professed followers of Jesus Christ the same idea prevails. All such persons will be found unsound on the



nature and remedy for sin ; and the fruit of such ministries will show that the sin question is not properly reached, and none of its advocates are being cured of the malady. In a previous chapter attention was called to the nature and character of sin ; we now desire to dwell upon its remedy.

The cross of Jesus Christ stands for God's suffering and sacrifice on account of sin. However awful the scene, and shocking to refined sensibility, it is the work of sin, a portrayal of its true nature and attitude toward purity, and we ought to be more shocked in the presence of what caused it than in the tragedy of Calvary itself ; and yet, strange to say, we speak in glowing terms of how revolting to refined sensibilities the scenes of Calvary are, and yet hug its cause to our bosom. Awful as this expression of its enmity is, it is not the complete revealment of its true nature. If sin could produce a Calvary, and not exhaust itself, it is certainly something more than a weakness or misfortune, and must have its cause of potency in something more than defective attributes. It is that which perverts the attributes of man's nature, and makes them incapable of self-adjustment. It is a vital enmity to God, that nothing but the blood of Jesus Christ has ever been able to remove. When John saw Jesus coming to him, he did not speak of him as "a lovely Example" they should seek to imitate, though he is pre-eminently such, but first as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the *sin* of

the world." A spotless, sinless life of love, vested with all possible powers, may charm, and call forth boundless admiration, but it cannot have anything in it to assure one of a remedy for sin; through it I might see the exceeding sinfulness of my sin, but it is mockery to ask me to imitate such a life, as only "like begets like," and sinfulness is the antithesis of spotlessness. Imitation of purity cannot overcome the malady of sin. One of the vital questions of the day is, How far can sin be eradicated in this life? Several theories are advanced. One is, that we cannot be free from its dominion in this life, — a common one among the masses of professed Christians. A multitude of witnesses who have lived under the dominion of sin prove by their saved lives that this theory is false. Another theory is, that the dominion of sin may be broken, but that sin cannot be eradicated. Another slightly more positive is, that divine infilling with the Spirit may paralyze the sin life, but not destroy it. This is the Keswick doctrine, easily adopted by earnest souls, as it leaves the vital fact untouched. These teach we are to reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin; but it is only reckoning, for no death has ensued. And the cardinal fallacy of this doctrine is, it requires us to regard ourselves as being what in reality we are not. Such a principle is utterly false, and is instantly to be rejected by a sound mind. That I do not misrepresent the teachers of this theory, I quote from Mr. Meyer, the leading advocate of this

doctrine, "The surest proof the old man is not dead is that he sends back the report that he is." Paul's report, then, according to the Keswick teaching, was false when he said, "I have been crucified with Christ, and live no more myself, but Christ is living in me" (Gal. ii. 20); and his doctrine untrue when he taught "that the body of sin [not sinful body] might be destroyed," (Rom. vi. 6); or when he propounds the question, "How shall we that are dead *to* sin live any longer therein?" Paul never taught that the surest proof the old man of sin was not dead was the report given that he was. This theory of a repressed sinful nature is exceedingly gratifying to the flesh in these days, when Christ is laying the axe at the root of the tree; it puts a limit on God's power, the extent of the atonement, and the sanctifying work of the Spirit. Because Messrs. Meyer, Gordon, Pebløe, Peirson, and others have reached successfully the repression of "the old man," it is no proof that equally reliable witnesses have not been made pure from sin.

We have just as much right to believe a witness whose truthfulness in other things cannot be questioned, when revelation and a number of equally reliable witnesses testify to the same facts. Another fallacy of these teachers is, they confound self and sin, teaching "two egos." The old man of Rom. vi. 6 is not *being*, but *sin*. The Word says, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." Either

our spirit-natures are pure or impure when begotten : if impure, we have nothing in consciousness that can portray purity, and we are incapable of the knowledge of the fact without its reality ; and he who testifies to its reality without the consciousness is a false witness, and he who denies the testimony of a reliable witness who demonstrates the spirit of his testimony is an unjust judge of another. When one states sin is not eradicated, he simply witnesses to his own states of consciousness, but cannot by so doing disprove another's testimony.

The blood of Jesus Christ is the objective cause of the removal of sin. *No amount of life purifies.* The Word does not say, "Now unto him who demonstrates 'the expulsive power of love,'" but "unto him who hath *washed* us from our sins in his own *blood*." Any theory that teaches the postponement of the utter eradication of sin must be false, or prove two things. First, that a proper interpretation of Scripture teaches the necessity of sin remaining in the believer. Second, that God can be as much glorified in a merely repressed carnal nature as in a purified one. The first has never been sustained by scholarly interpretation of the Word ; the second is contrary to the nature of God. The Scriptures nowhere represent love as a cleansing power. Love alone is not the remedy for sin ; it is blood, — blood sacrificially shed for us to meet the sin of our nature. Love is the spirit-life of true human nature.

which if not purged from sin can never be made perfect in love. Love has never been known to remove an impurity in the history of the race. When John said, "The blood       cleanseth us from all *sin*," he did not mean the acts expressing sin, or the penalty consequent upon sin, but of the sin itself. Purity as a subjective experience is impossible by admiring a beautiful life, or copying right conduct. Agony! agony!! for sin unto death; this is the thought that reveals its true nature. Christ in Gethsemane in the bloody sweat, in the dying groans, is the revelation of what is transpiring in the heart of God on account of sin, showing us its true moral character. He is none the less moved now than when clad in humanity for the same cause. Where sin is, his heart is moved graciously with compassion; and he points to Calvary's blood as an abiding expression of his sacrificial love for the sinner, and the remedy for his sin. A perfect, beautiful life may reveal what a being is in himself, but it takes the "blood drops" to show how such a being is related to another who has sin. Without this manifestation in blood of how God feels toward sin, there could be no basis for inward purity. The object of our cleansing is not love, however beautiful in form and power, but love in sacrifice shedding blood for the remission of sins and the purity of the sinner; and God having so expressed himself on Calvary, there needs no other sacrifice for sin: we can now see how he feels toward it, and his process

of removing it. To think he has any plan by which he only cares to repress it, and not remove it, is to minify its moral turpitude, or limit the present efficacy of his blood; for the theory that sin can be made serviceable is to prove some poison is healthy for a healthy system. A cleansed heart has keener sensibilities for the miseries and woes of others, and a more tender appreciation of the possibilities of salvation. This thought must not be overlooked in the demand for present purity.

The object for purity in the mind of God is not mere whiteness for its own sake, but the character a pure heart produces. Purity is not the *end* of the cleansing; it is the possibilities vested in a pure nature he has in view. Fitness, as much as prevention of evil, is involved in this question of purity. Correct conceptions of God, his love, and manner of revealing himself, are involved in purity. The pure in heart see (*know*) God. Cleansing removes the sin, and inwardly delivers the soul clear of it, so the light of truth may shine clearly through it. As long as there is conscious impurity, there will be a recoil from the immediate presence of God, and some form of substitute as a mediator that hinders the "face to face" revelation of God. When cleansed from sin we "draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." A revelation of God's holiness to a heart where sin is, causes him to seek a hiding-place. Through the blood

we enter a new and living way into the holiest of all. *Every* man that hath this hope in him of seeing Jesus as he is, "purifieth himself, even as he is pure."

The being quickened by the Spirit, or empowered by him, cannot impart a consciousness of purity; it is a negative state, and any amount of impartation can only mislead the soul from a clear discernment of a state of purity. Consciousness of impurity remains distinct after much empowering; nor will a soul be at rest in the purity of another, however pure: the soul must have purity transferred to itself to have a basis for fellowship. Our purity must partake of the nature of the blood that cleanseth us.

Much of the teaching of theology has been only half truth, or perverted truth concerning the object of Christ's shedding his blood, making it appear that God demands it as a satisfaction to appease his wrath, and not the truth that God himself was working in the sacrifice to "take away sin." The scapegoat went into the wilderness not to be punished, but to bear away the sins of the people. Christ bore our sins in his own body, that we, "being *dead* to sin, might live unto righteousness."

The terms "washed," "purged," "cleansed," refer to a process in us, and not a work done for us. "Wash *me*," said the Psalmist. "Purge *ME*," "cleanseth *us* from all sin."

To tell a soul to think like Christ thought, to love

like he loved, and walk as he walked, who by nature has neither ability nor disposition to do so, is to mock human helplessness under sin. To constantly talk about getting something that will empower us, separate from the transformation of ourselves, is a great fallacy. Purity necessarily precedes power, when the power sought is character and goodness. The idea of cleansing necessarily comes from one of sacrifice. Why do we want purity? Because of what it makes possible. To accomplish certain things there must be sacrifice, and sacrifice is death to selfishness. To accomplish certain moral things, purity is essential, and to be pure implies being cleansed from all sin. Jesus, "that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." He suffered that he might sanctify. Purity implies death to the sin life. It takes pure nature to undertake hitherto hopeless tasks with faith for victory. Purity of heart is essential to a pure gospel of Jesus Christ; only in proportion as the work of purity has been wrought in the church has the truth been seen and made to triumph. Purity is essential to right thinking concerning God. Right is not conceived by a logical process, but by revelation to a pure nature.

Many reduce the whole question of salvation to a pleasing romance, and our character a product of tender feelings toward God, when it means a pure nature so in love with right, it could not for one moment consider any other course of action; and sin in every form



is expelled from the domain of the heart. Christ demands by virtue of his sacrifice, on account of sin, that it be utterly removed from us ; as its continuance continues his suffering and the suffering of others, and his righteous law demands either the destruction of the sin, or of the sinner who will not come under his cleansing power.

“ Jesus, thy blood and righteousness  
My beauty are, my glorious dress ;  
Midst flaming worlds in these arrayed,  
With joy shall I lift up my head.”

## III.

## REGENERATION.

Ye must be born from above. — JESUS CHRIST.

No organic change, no modification of environment, no mental energy, no moral effort, no evolution of character, no progress of civilization, can endow any single human soul with the attribute of Spiritual Life. — HENRY DRUMMOND.

THE ingeneration of a new life into a dead spirit is the basal fact in our holy religion. It demands an act of the Author of Life, who alone can properly relate it to the form through which it is to manifest itself. When Nicodemus, an eminent teacher himself, came to Jesus to quietly interview this new teacher come from God, he showed his ignorance of spiritual truth in the questions he propounded, and Jesus showed his authorship of life in his answers.

Nicodemus, a rabbi, scholarly, respectful, a good sample of religious *development* under the most helpful environments, was, nevertheless, unspiritual. His thought had, no doubt, been quickened by natural revelation, his æsthetical nature stirred by the beautiful and the good, a thousand pleasing things had stirred his emotions; but none of them, or all combined, was not, nor could produce, spiritual life. Had he been

spiritual he would have had fellowship with Jesus at once, and other questions would have been propounded in keeping with his stage of spiritual life. Jesus, in his human consciousness, stood before him a revelation of true human nature quickened into being by the Spirit, and assured him there need be no mystery concerning it; that spiritual life was not a procreation from a living soul, but a direct generation by the Holy Spirit, and though a man should enter a thousand times into his mother's womb for birth, in each case it would be of the flesh, the difficulty being not the frequency of the birth, but the nature of the begetter.

It is high time the religious world settled down to the fact that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," and that there can be no spiritual life without spiritual generation. Ethical culture and intellectual development are helpful, and ought not to be ignored, but cannot produce spiritual life; and we do great violence to the truth when we place ourselves as witnesses to spiritual truth on such a false foundation. The masses who profess to be born again are depending on the refining and elevating influences of morals and correct externals as proof of spiritual life. These, no doubt, are helpful, and a character of growth may be discovered under their influence; but it is not the growth of a new life, but the corrective influence of thought on our wrong habits, but not upon our wrong nature. The flesh-nature can never become spiritual; an impassable

barrier stands before it. Man needs a revelation of God in his inner being, and that revelation a demonstrated verity, to settle forever all doubt ; and nothing short of a felt divine life can do it. About all that has been permanently settled in spiritual things has been established by test. In matter, mind, or spirit, proud reason can boast of but little triumph. To know God, which is eternal life, we must be born of his Spirit ; and the endeavor to know him by any other process must only lead to self-evolved theories contrary to the facts manifested to spirit-born souls.

Life is not a growth, an increase, a development, or an evolution ; it is an impartation, a gift. "The gift of God is eternal life." How can that which must come from outside us, and is not in us, be made to grow by anything we may do ? There are no forces for good lying latently in the hidden depths of our human nature, waiting for the fructifying influence of rain and sunshine to develop them into a lovely character. Everything after its own kind obtains here. If we have spiritual life, it must come from antecedent spiritual life. It is not self-generated or evolved. Jesus came to bestow it. "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly " The great conflict is between the theory of an ingenerated life and an evolved one. We teach that nothing spiritual can be evolved until it is first involuted ; that spiritual generation is a specific divine act, and de-

mands faith in the Person and Power that generated the human Christ.

We have not reached any ultimate analysis of life of any kind ; we only know it by its manifestations. Revelation tells us how we may know we have been regenerated, or born again. The regenerate heart "does not commit sin," "loves the brethren," "overcomes the world," "the wicked one touches him not," "hath the witness in himself," and "the Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God." None of these manifestations of divine generation can exist in the absence of the rest. There can be no response to God in a soul where his life is not found.

The law, "Do this, and thou shalt live," and "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," is not repealed. It is constitutional law, and there can be no repeal without changing the constitution of the race. God's method is to restore the life that made obedience possible, so that walking after the Spirit, "the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." To be regenerated, one must surrender the principle of disobedience to all known law. When we yield ourselves up to obey sin, we must necessarily become its servant ; and his servants we are whom we serve. Christ said, "No man can serve two masters." We sin unto death, or live unto righteousness. No man has ever been regenerated who has not yielded himself up to a life of filial obedience.

No man can love God and not love his brother. No man can have a preponderating love to God, and not overcome the love of the world. "To be fleshly minded is death."

Thousands believe with Matthew Arnold that Christianity is "morality touched by emotion," and not a divine life producing a Christly character. "Morality touched by emotion" may produce a religious zealot or sentimental self-righteousness, but can never produce a Godlike character in its relation to righteousness. Only those who are regenerated are willing to be put to the tests God's word requires of regenerate hearts. A desire for a better life, change of association and environment, good citizenship, temperate conduct, conformity to religious forms and services, may all exist, and one remain in an unregenerate state. Some of the most bigoted, un-Christlike professing Christians of to-day, living on cold logic and clear conceptions of what a regenerate heart should be, have never been regenerated, and are opposed to the life and spirit of those who have been. Nor does any amount of energy in a good cause prove the existence of spiritual life. Saul of Tarsus exceeded in this, and yet was "dead in trespasses and sins."

Life has forces of its own. A tree is but an outward expression of an unseen vegetable life; a Christian an outward expression of Christ's life in us; both grow or die as the life is, or is not, manifest through

them. Regeneration is the impartation of a distinct spiritual life in which is contained power over sin and its dominion ; and as long as the divine "seed" remains, sin's dominion is broken. The will has no power in itself over sin, but it subjects our beings to the divine life, and they have "power to become the sons of God." How useless to think of regeneration by our activities ! We are "born from above," "not of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God."

It is the nature of spiritual life to be sinless, and it is incapable of producing sin. The choice that begets sin, ejects the divine life from the soul. Regeneration is the beginning of a Godlike life in the soul, and its lowest activity is above sin ; and while this life remains, the sin life is overcome. Emphatically, regeneration is *renewal*, and not *removal*. It does not stand for the removal of anything infused by sin into our being. Sanctification negatively stands for this. As the absence of the divine life in man leaves him subject to the dominion of his sin nature, so the presence of the divine life saves him from this subjection. "Sin and death" represent cause and effect. Sin severs "the spirit of life in Christ Jesus." Regeneration restores it. "The spirit of life in Christ Jesus makes us free from the law of sin and death." To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded *is* life."

An expressed purpose to become a Christian in thousands of instances is considered sufficient to secure re-

generation, or is made an end, instead of a means toward an end. The sad feature in this case is, that nothing divine is revealed, and the soul remains in uncertainty concerning the facts that bring in "peace with God." A regenerate soul *knows* certain essential things concerning his relation to God, independent of sense or reason, by which he confidently calls him Father, and rests on his own promises voiced by the Spirit. As surely as one *feels* the warmth of the sun, standing under its warm rays, so surely every regenerate soul knows God. Every regenerate soul hath eternal life. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent ;" therefore every regenerate soul knows God. Regenerate nature produces righteous character by obedience to its illuminations, and it cannot be produced otherwise. Without this divine generation all the other glorious experiences of an unfolding life become impossible.

No wonder worldliness is walking up to our altars, and demanding recognition ; we must feed the spirit that dominates us, and without regeneration, do as we may, the carnal nature controls us. God is not a manifested presence, and none of the transforming influences of a new life enter into our activities. We can hope for nothing else but worldliness in the church until the other-world Spirit enters those who compose it. Whatever human society may do to elevate our conduct and change our environment, regeneration alone



can change our nature ; and this is essential to sonship with God. The modern doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is erroneous, based upon a false premise, and wofully misleading. There cannot be fatherhood without sonship ; there can be no sonship without spiritual generation ; and there can be no basis for brotherhood except sameness of spirit. That which has been made real to me is possible in the souls of others ; and our fellowship is conditioned upon something in common, by which we interpret each other's experiences. We portray to one another the subjective experiences, and know by comparison how far our relation extends. This is why the natural man cannot understand the things of God, *because* they are spiritually discerned. *What* we are to believe concerning Jesus, that we may have this life, is exceedingly vital. A belief that there was such a being is not half as vital as the belief that such a being came into existence from the human side, as the Scriptures teach. This act is the basis of faith. He that begat the human nature of Christ can impart the same life to us, making our natures the form through which the divine life is to manifest itself, instead of a new creation, making the process of sanctification the completion of our spiritual life, as far as restoration from spiritual abnormalities is concerned. Quickening, purification, growth, glorification, these are the processes used to make us like the Captain of our salvation. There must be the ingener-

ation of a new life ; there must be a purging of the old life. The new life makes our natures to grow in his likeness ; the purging removes the hindrances to this growth. Without the impartation of the new life, the purging of the old would be worthless ; for however pure we may become, we do not possess spiritual life in ourselves, and we would yield in our helplessness to the power of sin outside us. We need both ; cleansing from defilement, empowering from outside ourselves with a superhuman power. We need no longer marvel. We "must be born from above."

## IV

## HOLINESS.

Ye shall be holy, for I am holy. — *1 Pet.* i. 16.

Had one asked the Hebrew prophet, Why ought I to be holy? he had replied at his best, Because Holiness is the law of your being. Jesus accepted the law, but added, Because he ought to be like his Father. The law without became an instinct within. Holiness is conformity to type, and the one standard of perfection is God himself. — IAN MACLAREN, *Mind of the Master*, 111-112.

It was the men and women who were happy in their holiness, and holy in their happiness, who among the Methodists, as in every branch of the church, effectively fulfilled their mission in purifying and elevating society. — REV. WM. ARTHUR, *Ecumenical Conf.*, 1881, p. 71.

*Holiness*, root and crown, is a category of experience. — J. W. MENDENHALL, D.D., EDITOR *Methodist Quarterly Review*.

*Holiness as a doctrine has its ground in revelation.* It cannot be a human concept ; the ground cause for it is not in human nature, but in God. He said, "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy." He originally made us holy, as a demand of his own nature ; and though we have by sin lost the idea and the love of holiness, the demand of his nature is the same concerning mankind. Nothing short of holiness will produce harmony between our nature and his. This is not a matter of choice ; it is one of nature. He cannot fellowship sin or unrighteousness. He cannot change. The redemptive system was not created to change his attitude toward unholi-

ness, and make it possible for God to be to us what he could not be without it, but to change our attitude toward his holiness from "enmity" to love, and secure an at-one-ment between estranged natures, and restore a perfect moral constitution, distinct from the character it produces, or the choice that sustains it. No judicial adjustment can avail here, though prerequisite; it is not a question of law, but of nature. The end sought is an adjustment of natures, not attitudes. Because self-adjustment has been sought to relieve the pain consequent upon unrightness, we do not necessarily believe that an unholy nature can be made holy. This is a revelation outside ourselves. All effort at self-adjustment, unaided by revelation, has been as self-destructive as an exceedingly delicate engine without a governor. Human inability to fathom a remedy demanded divine interposition. Every elevating influence operating upon the race since the Fall has been from the outside. Unaided, mankind retrogrades. Under the Fall, it is not natural to love holiness; we are prone to evil "as the sparks fly upward."

*The possibility of being holy originates in the work of the Spirit within us.* God being love, he could create nothing impure; and the love that demanded a pure creation would demand a sustained purity, and have no sanction for impurity or moral imperfection. The work of the Holy Spirit within us is a setting forth in essential order the means necessary to restore man to holi-

ness ; the fact, the method, and the agencies unfolding as the Spirit leads us to them. If belief in the holiness of the race is natural, why such a conflict with "an evil heart of unbelief" ? After an abundant provision had been made for the holiness of the race, God was compelled to use agencies to arouse men to respond to his call to holiness.

*The spirit of holiness in God is the spirit of eternal rectitude.* It guards his nature from injustice or partiality. "The Judge of all the earth will do right." Sinless beings cry, "Holy ! Holy ! Holy ! Lord God Almighty ;" the purity and integrity of his nature in relation to all his works being the ground of their worship. His covenants are sworn to by the holiness of his nature, "in which it is impossible for God to lie." When he made us in his image, he gave us this spirit of rectitude, subject to our choice. Since the Fall, man is gone very far from original rectitude ; and though capable of intensifying his unrighteousness, he has no ability to restore himself : and yet *the nature of God and man's own nature demand holiness in him ;* and he never can be at harmony with himself, and all other selves related to him, until holiness is restored as his confirmed state of nature. God's nature could not be content to simply consider him holy, and man himself could not be satisfied by being so considered. It is not against his helplessness and its consequences the divine nature revolts ; for this he has boundless compassion :

it is against the sin that perverts his nature. To teach that "God covers defilement with a cloak, hiding it from view," not only limits his attribute of Omniscience, but his omnipotence. Can he *cover sin* in a nature he loves, and not see it? How? Is he not able to make a heart holy now? Is a covered-up antagonism any less an "enmity against God"? What purpose can he accomplish in covering what the possessor wants removed, and God has inspired the hope of its removal? If the holiness of another "is made unto me," I possess what he possessed, and not a mere belief that I possess it.

*The capacity for holiness is conditioned upon the nature of man.* If his spirit-nature is not capable of such a moral state, then he never can be holy, except in a ceremonial and judicial sense, and the doctrine of an imputed holiness is sound; but if his nature is capable of being made holy, capacity becomes a necessity. It is optional with us whether we will yield ourselves up to God; but, having done so, not optional to select the measure of conformity to his nature and will. We have no choice in the degree of salvation we will reach; obedience is pledged in our first yielding to God.

*To be holy, and filled with love, are not synonymous, though never separated.* Holiness is a state in which there is no portion of anything unlike it. Love is the spirit that animates a soul in that state. Holiness is a state of the spiritual temple, where a perfect sacrifice is continually offered by a holy priesthood. The tem-

ple is holy, the sacrifice is love's offering without blemish, the worshipper a priest and king unto God. There is no law in the universe against a holy heart. It is a state producing perfect obedience to the Law of Love.

*When man fell he lost the state and spirit of holiness, but not the capacity for it.* This is the ground of his endless unrest. Until these are restored, he sings:—

“My heart, thou knowest, can never rest  
Till thou create my peace;  
Till of my Eden repossessed,  
From every sin I cease.”

The capacity for holiness is now occupied by unrighteousness, and the life of unrighteousness is “enmity to God.” It is not merely a state of passivity, the absence of holiness and its spirit of love, but one of aggressive warfare against the spirit of holiness, misusing every faculty, and making our members as instruments of unrighteousness unto uncleanness. Regeneration infused a new life; and two elements contend for the mastery, — “the flesh against the spirit.” Holiness is the spirit-nature restored to its normal state, and filled with the spirit of love. But our capacity has capabilities for more, or less, according to the spirit that possesses it. Under love, “increasing and abounding more and more;” under sin, the opposite. A soul restored to the state of holiness does not imply that those restored to the same state have the same capacity, a necessary discrimination too often over-

looked. *Lost capacity cannot be restored as a gift*, but must come under the law of growth. A marked difference in capacity may make a marked difference in life and service, while both have entered the state of holiness.

*The selfhood is made holy.* Attributively, one self contains no more than another, but developed attributes differ largely in degree. No student of the spiritual hosts can fail to recognize this, and should relate his conduct and thinking toward them accordingly. A used faculty increases. Your self, not another's, passes through the process of cleansing and filling with the spirit of love. Another self with greater possibility passes through the same processes, and reaches the same state, but is enjoyed and possessed in proportion to the larger faculty. They occupy mutual grounds as to conscious purity, conscious sanctification, conscious holiness, but are considered in their magnitude according to the degree possessed. *Holiness as a state* has no increase *as a life* increases more and more in love and power.

*To make one holy is to rectify the nature that originates sin; therefore, while the state continues, holiness necessarily ends sin.* This statement would never be questioned if the individual would transfer his thought to the life of a saved disembodied spirit. We never think of their sinning. Who thinks that a redeemed one in the next life has the element of sin in him?



And yet in a moment they change places. What is there about the act of disrobing this mortality that ends the sin question? If we carry an unholy nature into the next world, we will generate sin there as here. It was in the spirit-world beyond its direful history began, without these "cumbersome bodies." It was in a real human body Jesus proved sin had no ground of necessity in nature, and could be destroyed as it originated. Under the most helpful environment angels introduced sin; under the weight of its curse Jesus "knew no sin, neither was any guile found in his mouth." Place does not determine my character; my character elects its own place. Unless we hold to the false theory that matter is evil, and our association with it makes sin a necessity, I can see no reason whatever why God should not now put an end to sin in any individual who so elects. If he can sanctify us wholly now, he must by that process rectify our spirit-nature; and if it retains its wholeness, it will not produce sin. "A good tree bringeth forth good fruit." Why should it be thought a thing incredible that God should rectify our spirit-natures now, and make them free from sin and sinning? When can he do so, if not now? What requires delay? Is it not necessary that I have perfect freedom to make any moral choice at all? and in what way would admittance into another life enhance my freedom? Possibility to sin exists while probation lasts, but not necessarily sin.

*If holiness means rectitude, then righteousness is the end of all being, and nothing else can be sought but a continuance of it.* Maturity is an exceedingly misleading idea; and a maturity that has no end has nothing in nature analogous to it. There is only one end to holiness,—the first end; namely, reaching the state of holiness. There is no maturity in the state, the spirit of which is love. Love knows no maturity; it is eternal in its increase. Its only epochal period is when it is perfect by the absence of everything contrary to it. A holy heart has only one end to serve; namely, to perpetuate its rectitude by obedience to its law. The death of the body, or its resurrection and glorification, is not intended of God to make our nature more Godlike and pure, but the furnishing an instrument capable of serving a glorified spirit in the activities of the life to come. Unless there are probation and test on the other side, which we see no necessity or revelation for, all our spiritual states are redemptively secured here, and our lives close with the statement, “He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness yet more; and he that is filthy, let him be made filthy yet more; and he that is righteous, let him do righteousness yet more; and he that is holy, let him be holy yet more.”

## V

## THE TWO EXPERIENCES CONTRASTED.

Ye are yet carnal. — ST. PAUL.

The pardoned are saved from sinning. — DANIEL STEELE, D.D.

Liberty of thought is allowed, liberty of sinning is alone denied. — IAN MACLAREN.

Thus the normal regenerate life does not differ greatly from the same life after perfection is reached. The difference is mainly internal. Before, evil desires sprang up from the ground of the heart, which *troubled* the soul though they did not *seduce* it. Now, they no longer make their appearance. Before, a portion of the soul's energy was lost in internal conflict. Now, the whole soul is a unity with itself. — ALFRED J. FRENCH, B.A.

MUCH confusion exists concerning the difference between the experiences of regeneration and entire sanctification. Many statements are misleading, and imply more than experience or God's word can warrant. Terms have been used interchangeably that mean more in one case than in another. Many difficulties have been removed by placing the experiences in contrast.

The first step toward salvation being *conviction*, I have for a long time defined as knowledge of the right, and conscious disobedience, producing guilt and condemnation. He who knows the right and consciously disobeys is convicted of sin, and condemned, whatever may be his feelings in the matter. The Spirit is under

no obligation to arouse a certain amount of feeling in a soul to produce conviction. His office is to show us the moral quality of our choices, and accuse or excuse us according to our determinations. No guilt or condemnation can exist independent of a deliberate unholy choice. An involuntary act can have no moral quality: no one stands convicted for any act he could not prevent; and as for inherited guilt, it is impossible.

To know right, and determine against it, incurs condemnation. Our feelings are controlled by our consideration of our choices. Whoever violates his knowledge of right is a condemned sinner. His choice expresses the fact that he has gone over to the side of wrong, and surrendered the principle of obedience. This fact holds where no outward act exists. To determine to disobey, whether we perform the act or not, incurs guilt that must be pardoned, or condemnation remains. Jesus said, "He that *hateth* his brother is a murderer;" and, "whoso looketh upon a woman to lust after her *hath already committed adultery* in his heart." Such a being is a sinner, though the act is never performed; for the being is committed to its performance, and not restrained by his will, but the influence that prevents the performance of the act. The habit of wrong-doing lessens the sense of condemnation, but does not make the soul any less guilty, or nullify the effect on one's nature. The theory that guilt is only commensurate with my feeling of it, is very false. The

greatest crimes have been committed for the most trivial reasons, with little emotion, because the seared sensibilities could not express the character of the wrong-doing. An awakened sinner does not increase his guilt by being awakened, but sees it in its real turpitude, and cries out, "What must I do to be saved?" Yet he would reject every charge as false if he was conscious he had not committed the sins the Spirit charges home upon him. Nor could he repent of that which he had no consciousness of committing; he might regret an unconscious act, but could never repent of it. Many think they can do wrong, and be in favor with God; "conscious faith and conscious guilt cannot coexist in the same heart." Faith of an evangelical kind is death to disobedience. As we accept or reject the light of the convicting Spirit, such will be the character of our feelings. To heartily accept the truth that condemns us, and acknowledge its truthfulness, must produce a profound feeling in any human breast; and where consent is gained to yield ourselves to the truth, there are several results which inevitably follow. The next step is *renunciation of, and repentance for, all our sins*. An inward assent to the truthfulness of God's claims against us is unavoidable. Our freedom is not involved in producing conviction; this is a sovereign act of the Holy Spirit. The renunciation of sin involves the determination of the sinner. God can do nothing beyond conviction toward saving a soul until he renounces

all his sins, condemns his own conduct, and shows his sorrow for sin by turning away from it forever. It would be impossible for God to save a soul from a sin the heart has not turned from ; to consent to it is to give it liberty to bring forth its fruit of death. Guilt cannot be removed while guilty acts are being performed. No terms of reconciliation could exist while rebellion continues. The principle of disobedience must be surrendered, not by force, but by choice ; therefore, through repentance my choice declares my renunciation of my sins. "Cease to do evil ; learn to do well. Let the wicked forsake his way," is God's order.

*Confession of all my sins* follows a true renunciation of sins. An unrenounced sin will never be truly confessed. There is much misunderstanding concerning confession of sins. Many urge a public parade of individual wrong-doing, detailed accounts of personal crimes and sins, gloating over recitals of shameful deeds, revolting to every lover of purity, and wholly uncalled for except by a vitiated taste. It, no doubt, would tend to draw such a crowd as the recital of some scandal fills a court-room, but there is no possible ultimate good to come of it. God has given us his order. *Public sins*, committed against society in general, need a public confession. A general wicked life destroys confidence in a man. A public confession, including an assurance of contrition and repentance, and that the sinner has renounced his sins, and is going to

walk in newness of life, is calculated to renew confidence, and rally sympathy and aid from those desirous to assist us in righteousness. It commits the confessor to a right life, openly confessing his own helplessness, and faith in Christ Jesus. To confess repentance, and continue to commit the acts of sin, destroys confidence; this accounts for the uselessness of thousands of professing Christians. To continue confessing sorrow for sin, and excusing ill-conduct, is hypocrisy. Godly sorrow rejects the sin, and not merely regrets the consequence. Public confession must precede pardon, as far as the will is concerned. Profanity, Sabbath desecration, intemperance, or any other public sin that aids to sustain an immoral standard, and damage the interests of society, should be publicly renounced and confessed. By his sin he has made a chasm between himself and his fellow-man. This has to be bridged by a hearty confession, and an avowal of right choice. The intention of a public confession is not to humiliate one before his fellow-men, but to relieve a heart already burdened with a sense of its guilt, and the irreparable evil done to society; and by confessing one's wrong, remove one's sanction from such conduct, in the interest of any who may have been wrongly influenced by one's example. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but he that confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." Next comes

*Personal confession.* No amount of regrets will clear

me of guilt if I hold that which I have taken from another, and can restore it. Sins against individuals, with evil intent, against reputation, health, purse, or personal welfare, must be confessed to the individual if possible. It takes more grace to face the individual I have wronged, and ask his forgiveness, and seek restoration, than to say we are sorry before a thousand persons we have not so injured. Jesus said, "If thou bringest thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee ; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way ; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Thousands who cannot find favor with God would do so if they would only "be reconciled to their brethren."

The other form of confession refers to *private sins*. In cases where individuals have mutually wronged one another, there is only one course to pursue ; confess to each other the humiliating fact, and ask each other's forgiveness, and pray for each other. This is necessary to prevent the commission of the same sins. Many would die before they would *penitently* admit they had wronged an individual with whom they had mutually sinned ; and yet this door, left open, will lead to the same disgraceful overthrow under temptation. We must confess, publicly, personally, privately, and all from a broken and contrite heart, to God. Every God-forbidden relation must be abandoned. If you think



you can pursue any other course, it will be to find a foe in your bosom that will betray you into the hands of your enemies. Last, but most powerful, there are *heart sins* to be confessed. How many awful things our wicked hearts have conceived that by the power of our wills never came to light, "the hidden things of darkness." All heart-sins are against God. Mankind have become such adepts at producing sin in refined forms, that they worship sins of their own conceiving. We make our sins, refine and garnish them, and then bow down and worship them ; and God is sinned against by awful idolatry in the heart, self-worship producing self-righteousness. Such men never penitently bow under a sense of guilt and shame until their idol is broken. In regard to all sin, it is against God, and he must ultimately forgive ; but this confession not only removes barriers out of the individual's way, seeking salvation, but removes barriers out of the way of others. When we are through confessing, we are ready to sue for pardon and salvation, and God promises it on the conditions above stated, that we abandon our sins *forever*, confess then, according to his clearly declared Scriptural terms, and trust him for salvation. "He will blot out all thy transgressions," and impart the divine life, giving power to save from the commission of sin. What a wonderful gospel ! We can promise every sinner pardon for the past, — a present, personal, conscious, *divinely imparted* salvation that

saves from the commission of sin. *He now commits his case to God for adjustment.* This is frequently confounded with consecration, which is another act. The Saviour has a right to save in his own way, and our inability to handle our own case demands that he exercise it as he wills, as we cannot tell him how. Should a patient complain at the manner an eminent surgeon accomplished his work, and he should be handed the instruments to finish his case, he would feel abashed. Here is the place for

*Faith*, always in the present tense; not "'tis done," the language of *experience*, nor "it will be done," the language of *hope*, but *he doeth it, it is now being done.* (The chapter on "Faith" explains this.) And now we close the steps in securing the blessed experience of regeneration, with the *witness of the Spirit*, — a divinely wrought persuasion that the things for which we believe have come to pass, and that we are accepted of God, whereby we cry "Abba, Father." A safeguard against this awful presumption the many have fallen into at the cost of their souls, and a prevention of this harassing doubt that destroys the happiness of so many souls.

"The Spirit answers to the blood,  
And tells me I am born of God."

We will now traverse the ground of the second distinct experience, and then show the difference between the two by a parallelism.

In the beginning we found the *sinner* convicted, *knowing right and doing wrong*, incurring guilt. In this beginning we find the *believer* convicted of *inward impurity*. The wrong-doing, acts of the will, incurring guilt ; the impurity, a state of the affections, producing self-abasement. Every justified soul is justified after he believes unto salvation by obedience. "He that is born of God doth not commit" any transgression of the law, "for sin is a transgression of the law ;" but every believer feels the sin-nature in him contending for the mastery. He knows it is not his physical life, for it can only manifest itself through the five senses ; and pride, anger, vainglorying, love of the world, and many other things of which he is conscious, are not the product of physical life. He knows they are not infirmities ; for while they come under the head of weaknesses, they have no moral taint. This is in the inward parts, "the man of sin." These things are the more clearly discerned because of the light of the new life, itself pure, imparted in regeneration. This being has gone over to the new life ; and "the new man" has dominion over "the old man," so his activities are not manifest in sinful acts. The new life is not "force," and does not gain its dominion over "the old man" by force, or by an "expulsive power" gradually eliminating it. Its operations are through the ego, the real man, renewed by an ingenerated life, empowering him to choose to refuse dominion to the sin life. Move as it may, it can-

not manifest itself in conduct incurring guilt, and forfeiting sonship, without a deliberate unholy choice. The renewed man walking after the Spirit does not mind (obey) the things of the flesh. *The gradual expulsion theory would have had no existence* if we had not confounded the strength that right determinations and holy choices bring to our renewed manhood by the law of growth, reducing the potency of the old life in its operations against us, in a warfare, that from the first finds us victorious; and *not reducing the life of "the old man,"* which has only one process of extinction, and that as a unit, for life is not divisible. Regeneration saves from unholy choices; but the universal testimony of the Christian church is, it does not produce in us a state of holiness—or entire sanctification. Regeneration renews our nature so we do not commit sin; sanctification purified our nature from the inbeing of sin. Regeneration saves us from unholy acts, entire sanctification from an unholy state. The Psalmist not only sought to have his transgressions blotted out, but that *he* might be cleansed. "Wash *me*," for "*I* was shapen in iniquity." "Purge *me*," for "*in sin* did my mother conceive *me*." "Thou desirest truth [rectitude] in the inner parts, and in the hidden parts thou wilt make *me* to know wisdom." The *transgressions* to be "*blotted out*," the *man* to be "*cleansed*." Purity cannot be a growth any more than pardon can be an impartation; both imply the *removal* of something.

To say we are made pure from all uncleanness of flesh and spirit is to contradict the word of God, and unchristianize thousands of the best-lived Christians who are constantly witnessing to God's regenerating grace, but who testify to a conscious impurity dwelling within, and a constant conflict to keep under control the vital life of sin. Many who object to a subsequent cleansing admit the existence of anger, pride, self-will, and ill-will struggling for the mastery. Knowing the heart is a clearer exponent of experience than the head, we proceed to declare some of the results when we yield to this conviction of conscious impurity. This conviction never comes to an unregenerate soul; nothing exists to set up the distinctions. The one carnal life has dominion; but now an opposite life appears, revealing the true nature of the other—hence the conflict. There is no condemnation,—he has peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; no sense of responsibility for the existence of “the old nature,” it is inherent, beneath all volitions, a loathsome one, with which there is a severed fellowship. Communion with Jesus continues. He loves the brethren, feels lust struggling, but puts his foot on its neck, and has victory.

*The sinner renounces his sins; the believer, the old man. Wrong acts must cease*, says the sinner, seeking a new life. “*The old man*” *must cease*, says the believer, seeking entire sanctification. The sinner seeking salvation is self-condemned because of sins he has chosen

to commit. The believer loathes a depravity transmitted by the law of procreation. In the language of the poet, he cries,—

“Oh, hide this self from me, that I  
No more, but Christ in me, may live;  
My vile affections crucify,  
Nor let one darling lust survive!  
In all things nothing may I see,  
Nothing desire or seek, but thee.”

The sinner confesses sins—public, private, personal—of the heart. The believer has at last discovered the root of them all. He confesses uncleanness; while predominantly in love with God, and in love with his servants and his service, he longs for a holy sacrifice to present to God. Sin has usurped a rival's place, and the entire throne must be given to his Divine Lord. He gives his redeemed, renewed life, a living sacrifice to God, not to be taken back and presented again, but “Thine evermore to be.” He submits his case to Jesus for cleansing, and filling with love. He has as precious promises to rest upon, and more, than when he sought renewal. Faith says he doeth it; the Spirit applies the blood, and sanctifies wholly, witnessing to his own work; and the believer, resting in possession of the reality, sings:—

“Now rest my long divided heart,  
Fixed on this blissful centre, rest;  
Nor ever from thy Lord depart,  
With him of every good possessed.”

## A PARALELLISM.

SINNER. — In conscious disobedience. An act . . . of the will,

BELIEVER. — In conscious impurity a state of the affections,

incurring guilt and condemnation. To be pardoned. A legal act.

producing self-abasement. To be cleansed. A moral act.

Through faith in the blood of Jesus. Regenerated by the Holy

Through faith in the blood of Jesus. Sanctified wholly by the

Ghost. A new life imparted. Witnessed to Rom. viii. 16.

Holy Ghost. A new nature imparted. Witnessed to Heb. x. 14, 15.

## VI.

### THE BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY GHOST.

Jesus is the only baptizer with the Holy Ghost ; he never mistakes his subjects. — *AUTHOR.*

The passage from the traditions of the Synagogue to the faith of Pentecost cost nothing less than a violent moral and intellectual wrench, such as could be achieved only by a supernatural force, interrupting the old stream of thought and feeling, and introducing a new one.

The day of Pentecost was not to be deemed a day apart ; it was merely the first day of the Christian centuries. — *CANON LIDDON.*

THIS wonderful experience, that so comparatively few enjoy, but is so often ignorantly prayed for, is the inheritance of every true believer, and an essential requisite to a successful ministry of the Word of God. It is the crying need of the church of to-day. It is a definite experience, distinct from regeneration, or any blessing accompanying it. It must be clearly distinguished from a spiritual renewal, or any bestowment of added power or grace. It is the oil anointing us, fire on the sacrifice, the power of Christianity. It is distinct from the witness to our regeneration, or being regirded with new power. Its distinctive result is purity, which baptism prefigures. No manifestation of feeling or joyfulness is proof of its existence. One may shout, have great volubility of speech, be



intensely in earnest, and never have received the baptism with the Holy Ghost. It is more than the blessing received by the disciples when Jesus breathed upon them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" and to those who receive both, is clearly distinct from the witness of the Spirit: the one witnesses to our repentance and faith for salvation; the other, to our consecration and faith for inward purity. That a distinct experience, called purity, as a result of this baptism with the Holy Ghost, was obtained on the day of Pentecost, Peter plainly affirmed before the church council at Jerusalem. It was not their conversion, for Jesus had told them their "names were written in heaven." They had left all to follow him. He had breathed a measure of the Spirit upon them after his resurrection. They had great joy in seeing a risen Christ, and their hearts burned within them as he talked with them. After commissioning them anew to preach his gospel to all nations, he told them to wait at Jerusalem, saying, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." In his wonderful prayer he said, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." They had "surely known" that he had come from the Father. They were together in the upper room, not crying for mercy, or seeking forgiveness, but in mighty prayer "waiting for the promise of the Father." Peter had been restored, and thrice avowed his love. Thomas was

present, without any harassing doubt, looking for the same gift as the rest. Matthias had been chosen to fill "the place in this ministry and apostleship from which Judas fell away," and yet they had not received "the baptism with the Holy Ghost." When it was bestowed, Peter said it was the fulfilment of a prophecy made by Joel centuries before, that had never been experienced in the past. This was the promised Holy Spirit himself coming to take possession permanently of the temple his dispensation demands. No longer in letter, but in life, is the truth to be known; not in form or symbol, but in spirit and in truth. Law now is to be written, not on tables of stone, but upon the fleshy tables of the heart. Outward service is to be the expression of an indwelling spirit. The true attitude of those who seek this baptism is that of consecrated beings waiting for a gift, not in listless abandonment for its bestowment, but continuing "steadfastly in prayer." Is it conceivable that a hundred and twenty unregenerate men and women would spend ten days in prayer for a promised gift, no one to lead them, nothing to cling to but a promise of the absent leader? What straits some people go to, to sustain a false view of truth. And the results—"suddenly" they were *all* filled; the Holy Spirit *fell* upon each of them. This is the *poured-out* baptism from the hand of the *only* administrator of the baptism with the Holy Ghost. There is no reason why it

should be "shed forth" by profusion in the beginning, and manifested by accretion afterward. This is not the aggregated power of a well-developed moral nature. Peter, relating what occurred when at the household of Cornelius, said, "The Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word."

The absence of this gift in the church accounts for the increasing worldliness, the spiritual blindness, "not seeing afar off," the lack of fruit in the masses of the ministry, and the general lawlessness prevailing throughout the world.

Two classes of results follow this peculiar gift. The first, *Subjective*, — *A clear revelation of the nature and character of Jesus Christ*. Jesus said, "He will take the things of mine, and shew them unto you." Things pertaining to his selfhood that no objective form of revealment could disclose. Peter under this baptism emphasized the fact that Jesus was both "Lord and Christ." Unitarianism could never have had any existence, if the believing world had retained this baptism.

As no "man can call Jesus Lord except by the Holy Ghost," no man can call him Lord without the Holy Ghost. The divinity of an unseen Christ is a revelation the Holy Ghost alone can impart; nor can any attempts at improving the social or moral life of society take the place of this baptism. Temperance, social purity, a true socialism, good government, and

a thousand minor results, would follow this mighty baptism. The community of interests in the early church was not the result of purified governments and wise legislation, but of pure hearts filled with the Spirit of Jesus. The outcome of the inward rectification was, "And day by day, continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people."

This baptism is the fulness of spiritual life that quickens into intensity our whole being. We don't train our spirit-natures up to the point of holy living. Holy living must be preceded by a holy being, and there cannot be a holy being without an indwelling Holy Spirit. To imitate Christ without Christ's Spirit dwelling in us, is to mock our convictions. Unless Christ is formed within by the transforming power of his indwelling Spirit, there will not be any outward conformity to his life. Paul said, "For me to live is Christ;" but he gives his reason: It is no more I, but "Christ liveth in me." He says, "When it pleased God to reveal his Son in me," I conferred not with flesh and blood.

Previous to this baptism, Jesus is more especially known in those offices of his that mediate a work for us, — pardon, salvation from guilt, and atonement for our sin; the works, more than the nature and charac-

ter, of Christ, are revealed in preceding experiences. Under this baptism the holy nature and spotless character of Christ are brought to view. His personal sinlessness, his purity of life, the nature of the life that begot him, are revealed in unsullied beauty. Though tempted, it was not as sinful human nature is ("*as we are*" is not in the original, but is supplied); but he was tempted as those are who are "without sin." When we are purified and filled with the Holy Spirit we have some conception of his spotless, sinless human nature. Being internal and subjective, this baptism is conceived through promise, and *known by experience*. It is not the conclusions of logic, but a *felt revelation* of Christ through the Spirit. There is no outward form can express it, and one filled with the Spirit may be charged with being under Satanic influence. They said of Jesus, "He hath a devil;" of Paul, "Much learning doth make thee mad;" of the believers at Pentecost, "They are filled with new wine;" but *to one another* the diversified manifestations were understood by their having the one spirit. This inner "seal," "white stone," "new name," "mystery of godliness," "revelation of Jesus Christ," rules out of our thinking, libraries of human speculation. Another inward result is an intensified vision of truth. That this baptism aids the intellectual faculties is true, but I now refer to spiritual illumination beyond all mental processes. "An unction from the Holy One," by

which spiritual realities are clearly discerned, revealing the sources of spiritual life, and taking the spirit-nature away from those dependencies heretofore relied upon, because the truth is made known ; showing the soul how to have all grace abound toward it, so that in everything there may be a constant, symmetrical, spiritual growth ; imparting increasing ability and fruitfulness in service, "and increasing in the knowledge of God." No teacher having received "the baptism," ever, from any inner consciousness, teaches the doctrine of repressed sin as the highest attainable point in Christian experience in this life. The severity and intensity of his own purity under this baptism would exclude his teaching others the impossibility of reaching this state. On the other hand, thousands have recalled their false theory after receiving this baptism.

After this experience the self-disturbing element is absent. No more place-seeking for the "sons of Zebedee." No fear in Peter, no doubt in Thomas. All natural characteristics remain, strong or weak. All the sinful element is removed ; and whatever characteristics one may possess, they are not perverted by sin.

Another internal result is an intense love for God's family. The scenes of Pentecost and the young church reveal this. No less individuality exists ; but it is penetrated by the spirit of love for others, and centres our individuality on them and not self. The true law

of relationship is discovered, and what would bless others becomes a mutual blessing to ourselves.

*Some of the outward manifestations* are, steadfastness in the use of the means of grace, diversity of manifestations with unity of spirit, instead of uniformity of expression or emotion. All uniformity of dress, terminology, mannerisms, emotions, or even methods of worship, are contrary to spiritual life, and feed the æsthetic nature and not the spirit life. Another external result is *enlarged systematic liberality*. This accounts for the ability of poor people, full of faith and the Holy Ghost, paying liberally all their liabilities, without begging from the world, or resorting to questionable methods to secure means to continue Christ's kingdom.

A very marked and noticeable result of this baptism is *circumspection* of conduct and speech. Pure thoughts inspired of love do not suggest improper language. We are holy in all manner of living.

A few words on how to obtain this baptism.

We must *now* be obedient children of God.

We must seek it for the fitness it imparts to glorify Jesus, and serve the race. We must reject every form of uncleanness from our choice. We must consecrate all we have and are to God in the language of the poet,—

“My body, soul, and spirit, Jesus, I give to thee,  
A consecrated offering, *thine evermore to be.*”

Then believe that the Lord, the Spirit whom you seek, will “suddenly” come to his “temple,” cleansing and filling it, and the fire will fall, the dross will be consumed, the heart “shall see God” in his fulness and the plenitude of his grace, the testimony will roll, the lips will magnify the Lord, unbelief will have disappeared, service will be a delight, the inheritance of the saints will burst upon the enrapturing gaze, a conscious purity that cannot be described will be felt, and love like a flame shall ascend from the altar of a purified heart, as a sweet incense. God will no longer be in the distance, but in the heart, now made ready for his home. The softest whispers of his love will be music. He will have thy undivided heart for himself, and bring forth a glorious fruitage in thee, while you sing :—

“ I worship Thee, O Holy Ghost !  
I love to worship Thee ;  
With Thee each day is Pentecost,  
Each night, nativity.”



## VII.

## CRUCIFIXION WITH CHRIST

Not a reckoning, but a reality in us.

I have been crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me. — *Gal.* ii. 20.

THE doctrine of imputation has been used in considering this subject by many who, by virtue of their own experiences, are compelled to deny the reality. There is a vast difference between something considered done for us by another, and something actually wrought in ourselves. This is the dividing line between the genuine and the spurious in the work of death to sin and crucifixion with Christ. A modern school of teachers, somewhat in advance of their brethren spiritually, are teaching that we are to reckon ourselves dead to sin, but that it is only a reckoning and not a reality. They also teach "two egos," a sin-self and a Christ-self, and exclude the only real self, *myself*. The doctrine taught by those teachers can have no foundation on scientific grounds, and would never have been framed by them, and laid open to such criticisms, if their fundamental facts in theology were not false; and with those forms they seek to keep in

some form of statement the realities of their souls' experiences. No doubt the writers have won a victory over sin beyond their former experience, but that their victory is the only one to be won in this life, is contrary to the testimony of the best saints the world has ever known. In seeking to prove their position, they not only detract from the true lustre of the saints of God, but hinder those who are ready for a more advanced stage of spiritual life than they themselves enjoy.

This crucifixion is twofold: first, death to sin; second, devotement of ourselves sacrificially with Christ in the work of redeeming the world. Not repression, but crucifixion, of "the man of sin;" not accounting ourself dead, but "that the body of sin might be destroyed," a necessary fitness for heaven. No third experience is necessary, implying a death to self after a death to sin; the only self-death possible is not the destruction of human nature, but the impersonal man of SIN. There is nothing in the spirit-nature of man that cannot now be adjusted by the Spirit of God. No material law can hinder the purity or perfection of our spirits. The doctrine that matter is evil is not stated by these writers; but their conclusions are drawn from it, and consequently they plead for sin's continuance unto the end of life. This class of writers also teach that there are "two egos" in antagonism to each other, which must continue until death, and that "the old

man" is a being instead of a life; or vitality impinging upon our real self; personified in Scripture as *I*, but impersonal; called "the *old* man" in distinction from "the *new* man," neither of which is being, both of them a life; the one "carnal," the other "spiritual"; the one imparted from Adam by generation, the other by generation from the Holy Spirit. In neither case is personality bestowed, but a quality of life. I do not mean being is not begotten, but the carnal imparted when begotten is not being, but life; and that the Holy Spirit does not give a personality other than ourselves, but creates *anew* this personality, after the divine image, by a new life. For *me, myself*, to be filled with the one without being emptied of the other is an impossibility; therefore, the doctrine of being "filled with the Spirit" while sin remains, is untrue. The absence of the sin-life is essential to the fulness of the divine life. Too frequently the indestructible *I* (being) is used interchangeably with the destructible impersonal *I* of sin. *I myself* will always be some one, somewhat, somewhere. No regeneration, sanctification, resurrection, or glorification will destroy this being. Christlikeness is not the formation of another being, but the transformation of this being into his likeness; the essential elements of human nature existing in us both, from which the sameness comes by becoming partaker of the divine nature. Oxygen united with hydrogen gives us water; separated, it is pure oxygen.

Sin united with human nature gives us depravity; separated, we have pure human nature. Sin taints and perverts life. Had there been no life to taint and pervert, there had been no sin. Material laws do not govern our spirit-nature, and changes in our physical life or outward acts cannot reach our spirit-natures. Resurrection, much less death, can do nothing for us in this realm.

The Apostle Paul made a very clear distinction between self and sin. "It is no more *I*, but *sin* that dwelleth in me." The "*I*" and "*me*" is himself; the not-self of sin is dwelling within; this must be removed before a normal self can appear. This not-self is to be "crucified," "destroyed;" being destructible, it may, yes, must, die. Paul's theory was not repression, but destruction. He says, if "the body of sin" is destroyed, we should not serve sin. He taught deliverance from sin, and clearly told the way. He made no plea for its continuance; no good end could be served by its continuance. God has no use for it, and man has no need of it, and it cannot exist anywhere without producing defilement, for it is defilement itself; the processes for its crucifixion are spiritual, and therefore at hand. The Psalmist prayed, "Wash *me* from mine *iniquity*, and cleanse *me* from my *sin*." "Purge *me* with hyssop, and *I* shall be clean." Not repress, but "purge;" not *self*-destruction, but *sin*-destruction and *self*-cleansing.

The figure used to represent the fact is a very clear and bold one, viz., crucifixion. No taking it for granted, or imputed crucifixion. ANOTHER could not go through the process for us, as WE need the process ourselves. This is not something to be done for us, but in us; consequently it could not have been done on the cross nineteen centuries ago. The process is painful, severe, intense, creating in us an experience of which we are conscious, and that coincides with other experiences. WE feel the nails driven, the agony, the death, and the resurrection power that raises us up by Christ Jesus. What dies? Not *us*, but *sin*. How? By crucifixion. What do you mean when you say as Paul, "we who died to sin, how shall we live any longer therein?" We mean the cessation of all inward living movements toward sinfulness, producing the following results: a quickened physical life; a filled spiritual life, and freedom from sin; "the passions of sins" being dead wherein we were held. Instead of sin lasting as long as we are in the body, the body does not last as long on account of the existence of sin, and its removal "quickens our mortal bodies," and prolongs our physical life in many cases. A plausible and prevalent theory taught by Messrs. Moody, Meyer, Gordon, and others is that these are not experiences, but facts imputed to us.

Dr. Gordon says (and he is a strong representative of this school), "It is very common, for example, to

find writers on the Higher Christian Life urging us to become 'completely crucified with Christ,' and 'utterly dead to sin.' But these are not experiences or attainments, they are fundamental facts. . . . It is simply a fact that when Christ our Substitute died on the cross for us, we died virtually or judicially through him to the law and to sin."<sup>1</sup> This clearly states what the author means. All the death occurred when Christ died, and that was "judicially" for us. Search these writings as you may, and no *real* death to sin ever occurs. The fallacy of the whole system is expressed in this sentence, "The strange vine is the doctrine that regeneration is a 'change of nature,' instead of the communication of the divine nature. If human nature can be bettered, why may it not be sanctified? And then why may not perfection in the flesh be attained? But because we believe that the carnal man is incapable of becoming subject to God's law, we hold that the believer will never attain unto perfection until he has put off this tabernacle."<sup>2</sup> What a confounding of terms — "human nature," "flesh," "carnal man." Cannot human nature be bettered and sanctified? What part of Christ "grew and waxed strong in spirit," and "increased in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man"? Was it not his human nature? Is "the flesh" that is enmity against God and man, one and the same? Who is "the

<sup>1</sup> *Twofold Life*, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 132.

believer" that is to attain perfection when "he has put off this tabernacle" that Dr. Gordon seems to think is a bar to perfection now? He was before he believed, he will be after he puts off this tabernacle. Was he human nature? Certainly, but much different after he became partaker of the divine nature. He partook of the divine, that, whereas sin reigned unto death by his partaking of sin, now grace "might reign through righteousness unto eternal life" by his partaking of the divine nature. What becomes partaker of the divine nature? To this there is only one answer, human nature. Is it not "bettered" by becoming partaker of the divine nature? Does the divine nature become perfect when we put off this tabernacle? Did Christ's death, resurrection, or exaltation destroy his human nature? All these false premises arise from the teachings of this school, that man has "two egos," and he becomes in regeneration another being, instead of a partaker of another life in the same being, the fulness of which fits human nature for the divine indwelling. They also confound a real death to *sin*, and the sacrifice of a redeemed and purified *self* to co-work with God in saving the race.

No place can be reached in this or any other life where the cross is made natural to a purified nature. The right nature, filled with pure love, gladly bears the cross, despising the shame; but there would be no cross to bear if there was no sin outside such natures

to be destroyed. A pure nature has no self-imposed cross, but lovingly bears sacrificially the sin of others, until it is really removed by cleansing, and sanctification of soul, body, and spirit. This school also ignores God's process for the removal of sin. "If we were in such unbroken communion with him that there were an unceasing flow of the divine life through our souls, sin would be overborne, quenched, and destroyed."<sup>1</sup> If this principle of destruction of sin were correct, "unbroken communion," being wholly a matter of attitude of the individual, would *destroy* sin, and one need not wait until he "puts off this tabernacle" to have sin destroyed; but it is because sin is not destroyed we do not have "unbroken communion with him;" and it is not destroyed by "unbroken communion with him," but by crucifixion with him of that which breaks the communion.

After this destruction of "the old man," the sin-life, and the purified nature is spirit-filled, there is no self-life to die. There is a constant cross to bear, in yielding ourselves up to co-work with God, as "living sacrifices." We are frequently called upon to suffer on account of others, to manifest God's love in us to them and sacrificially enter into their conditions; but this is not a death or crucifixion of self: the real self is in the suffering that may culminate in a death as cruel as the cross, or more intense still, a heart

<sup>1</sup> *Twofold Life*, p. 143.



broken with sorrow for others ; but the real self is not subject to death, other than death in sin. Sin may cease to be ; the sinner, or the one separated from it, can never cease to be. He who suffers in the presence of evil now must always suffer in its presence, if his nature remains unchanged, until the evil-doer is beyond the redemptive power of love. In proportion to his love will be the ratio of his suffering. To die or cease to love would be easy, but while sin remains those we love must cause us suffering in proportion to their evil. It is true, love prompts the sacrifice ; but it is no less love's *sacrifice*. It is no less a cross because love sets out compensations for those who endure it. God's "only begotten Son" was his love-sacrifice for the sinner. Jesus "gave himself for us," and was obedient even unto the death of the cross to redeem us ; having the joy set before him of seeing a glorious fruition "in bringing many sons to glory"

When our love has been made sweeter by a purified affection, to leave loved ones, to go with Jesus to the ends of the earth, can never be painless ; nor can any degree of death to sin make us insensible of our loss, but rather increases our sorrow. Paul in parting with the disciples on the seashore was wrung with grief when he said, "Why cause ye me to weep, and to break mine heart?" Had he been anything less than pure he would have yielded to their entreaties, as they were

so sure he would see their faces no more; but love as steadily holds us sacrificially to the will of God, as it tenderly breaks every tie to please him. As long as sin is in the world we must make great sacrifices for those we love, in our loyalty to God. Some are teaching stoicism for love; a death to every human law, quoting the words, "That both they that have wives be as though they had none;" and holding that death to self ends all human loves, and makes us consider those related to us as nothing more than any other. Much evil only can come of this fallacy, and all endeavor to quench our natural affections is of the Devil; they are to be subservient to the will of God. Pure natural affection is not antagonistic to the will of God, else it would be carnal; but it is a part of God's present plan in saving the race, to sacrifice the natural to the spiritual, and the lawful but not expedient to the higher law of the present will of God.

*The only self that can die is the impersonal self of sin;* and when this is accomplished the real self is intensified, and made more susceptible in every part to everything that normally belongs to it, and to the approach of everything that hinders or detracts from it. With *sin* dead, one is not insensible to a slight, but is not angered; nor to persecution, but it arouses pity instead of retaliation; for deprivation of lawful things by avarice, one returns good for evil. If a natural affection changes, it shows the supernatural love of God. To

a pure nature, the act of the wrong-doer is not all that he feels ; the condition of the wrong-doer is more than the wrong act perpetrated by him. After crucifixion of sin, and laying ourselves sacrificially on God's altar, we have abnormal physical powers that are sources of temptation, and must live as long as the body remains. Generative organs have a natural purpose to serve, and may be involuntarily excited by physical defects and causes.

Appetites must not be destroyed, but corrected, and all filthiness of the flesh removed. To eat, to drink, to marry and produce offspring, are not wrong ; and no act is in itself unclean while we conform to Nature's laws, and do not yield to that which is prompted of evil. Nor does any of these things entail guilt or impurity to our souls unless we have disobeyed a known law. One is not a sinner, or impure in nature, because he lacks the knowledge that regulates the amount and quality of the supplies for his appetites. Abnormal physical life may make abnormal demands ; and for lack of knowledge one may supply them according to physical instinct, only to learn by sad experience, that the body is to be kept under. And perhaps for this lesson, as much as anything else, fasting was instituted. But to repeat an act with our bodies against the light of knowledge, is to jeopardize the spirit life, and give the flesh dominion over a purified Spirit, bringing it under bondage to sin.

There is a real crucifixion :—

Impersonal vital sin, the impingements of which are clearly distinguished from ourselves, may be destroyed.

The “*ego*” is indestructible, and is not to be crucified by any process producing extinction, but to be a living sacrifice to the higher law of divine Love.

The love of the creature for the creature only, ends with this life, as its purpose ends here.

Sin is antagonistic to human nature, — our own and others, — and must be destroyed, to have our natures free to perform the functions divinely assigned them. The crucifixion of ourselves sacrificially to save others is a means of development and enlargement of our spiritual powers ; and no one can lose anything essential under this process.

When sin is destroyed, doubt is removed ; that is, the element of disbelief. An honest inquiry may exist in a crucified nature, but no desire to reject revealed truth remains. A mere desire to be rid of the mortification sin produces is not sufficient cause for its removal ; the sin itself must be loathed, and we die to any sympathy for it.

Sin is a vitality, not a thinking.

However you may dress up “the old man,” he is “the old man” still.

The old man don’t need sympathy, but nails.

Some think they can train out the old man ; some, that if taken soon enough, he can be whipped out of children ; but the Word says only one way, — “ *Crucified.* ”

To be made “ a new creature ” saves from sinning ; to be “ crucified with him ” is death to sin itself.

## VIII.

## RIGHTEOUSNESS UP TO THE STANDARD OF THE LAW.

And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. — *Rom.* iv. 3.

But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified. Was not Abraham our father justified by works in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works faith was made perfect. — *James* ii. 20, 23.

The church which, under the cover of dogma, disbelieves in the power of Christ to lead us out of actual selfishness; which believes that men can be saved from sin by holding certain opinions about God, without ceasing from sin; which impugns the honesty of God by assuming that he never intended us to do as his Eternal Son tells us: which presumes that God would promulgate a divine gospel which is unnatural law, and which men cannot practise; which puts forth Christ's righteousness as something to take the place of our own, so that we can go on enjoying the world's comforts, and gaining its profits according to its covetous customs; — not by such a church will God convert the race.

Our Redeemer lives, and his Spirit reigns; and there is no more excuse for our abiding in unrighteousness. — GEO. D. HERRON, D.D.

Righteousness without love is not Christianity. — CANON FREMANTLE.

THE ground of conflict between theologians to-day concerning righteousness, is between an "imputed" and an "imparted righteousness;" the one judicially relating us by faith, the other wrought in us by spiritual renewal. There must be an imputed righteousness before an imparted righteousness. Our past, and

the possibility of continued adjustment to the demands of a holy law, requiring perfection in every part, must be settled before we can consider properly personal subjective experience. The difficulty has not been that imputed righteousness is not true, but the denial of an imparted righteousness, not as a cloak to cover defects, but as inner spiritual rectitude. Imputed righteousness is the righteousness of another accounted judicially against our unrighteousness, so that our unchangeable past is forgiven, and all our defects are continuously atoned for through Jesus Christ. In other words, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses." Where the soul is yielding up to God to be made righteous, God works righteousness of the Christ type into that soul, *relating him judicially* as Jesus Christ is, in all his sinless perfection; crediting him with the righteousness of a perfect humanity, because he is consentingly now in the process of being made complete in him. But should he fall out with the divine process, and "turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, all his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." Imputed righteousness being a condition of the mind of God toward a believer, and not a state of nature in a believer, must be a matter of pure faith without

demonstration. As a believer, I am an heir of a completed righteousness. He so considers me, and accounts me, and will make me, if I continue in the process. The administrator of the law judicially accounts me as meeting all its requirements, because I am a believer. I understand by a believer one who is in obedience to known law. What I am not correlated to is unconditionally completed up to the righteousness of Jesus Christ by God's own processes. Not that I am now by my faith, or on account of my faith, considered up to the righteousness of Jesus Christ, but, because of my faith, God is committed to carry through all the processes that make my righteousness as the righteousness of Jesus Christ.

Thus far imputation covers my past, my present lack, and whatever is between me and perfect conformity to all law for the future. When ultimately "like him," the present will be an actual righteousness, conforming to every law, under which we reign in righteousness.

*Imparted righteousness* is another thing. It is that inner conformity of our being to the law of rectitude, that measures up to the fullest demands of the law; viz., the law governing spirit-nature. Imputed righteousness is that adjustment of our lack of perfection, growing out of our sinful nature and its weaknesses, that, conditioned upon a right attitude of the heart, frees us judicially from all the demands of a holy law.



Imparted righteousness is that inner rectitude that fulfils the law in our word *Love*. Love is the real life of our spirit-nature. "Love is the fulfilling of the law" governing our spirits. Here is the root of which holy living is the flower. "The righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." There is no higher law than love; there is none more exacting, and none more easy when the heart is pure and full of love. "The end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart." *Imputed righteousness fills up the deficiency of weakened faculties*; imparted righteousness the harmony of the inner life. I rest in the one by faith; I rest in the other in conscious purity. The one judicial, covering every deficiency below the Adamic standard; the other renewing me in the spirit of my mind, "which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."

*Whenever moral beings express themselves in any spirit contrary to love, they are morally wrong.* No other spirit could be right, and moral opposites cannot both be right. There is only one spiritual righteousness possible, — a spirit in which everything contrary to love is excluded from it. Such a spirit may be limited and undeveloped, but its life knows no intenser purity. Love can have only one quality, and is subject only to greater measure, according to our capacity. He who loves has no sense of pain for doing so. However it may increase, no measure of it can create unhappiness.

The more we have of it, the more we are like God and his Son Jesus Christ.

*Righteousness never causes disturbances in a right mind.* A right spirit within us prevents many a wrong thought even existing, and gives us the mastery over those that unfavorable environment suggests. To undertake to have pure thoughts without a pure heart, is to seek an effect without an adequate cause. Intellectual strength has been manifest through the revelations of truth to a righteous heart, as no amount of struggle from the outside has been able to reveal. The righteousness of the man removes the greatest obstacles to intellectual progress. The boy without letters, whose inner being had never lost its equilibrium, or clouded his intellect by the disarranging effects of sin, confounded the teachers whose righteousness was the product of self-restraint and self-endeavor. In the conflict between argument and logic, against life and righteousness, the boy won. This leads to the thought that:—

*Righteousness up to the standard of the law is not the product of obedience to the letter of the law, but of "the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" which secures obedience to the spirit of the law.* Pharisaism is doomed. Except our righteousness exceeds theirs, we cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. Rigid conformity to a dead letter is the quietness of the undecaying, embalmed corpse, the endeavor meant for life "killeth." The law of righteousness demands love; the spirit of life

in Christ Jesus is love. Love fulfills the law. Every act not born of love is a carnal act ; its inspiration is the flesh, and if we walk after the flesh we die. Therefore, correcting false habit, having pleasing manners and temperament, encouraging good impulses, or any other evolution of a nature prompted by self-interest, is far short of the righteousness of the law. *Righteousness must be imparted before it can be expressed.* It is a "spirit of life," and not the letter of legalism, which could only produce outward reformation. Making the letter of a truth law, and then without spiritual aid conforming to it, is the damning act of unbelief. When Jesus *prejudged* that standard, and condemned it, they crucified him. When Jesus said, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," he did not mean that simply to record them would make the record, *the letter* spirit and life. The letter cannot be spirit ; words, like acts, are only representative things. He meant the spirit of the words accompanied them ; that is what made the familiar words of Scripture in Peter's sermon at Pentecost such a power to awaken thousands. Powerless as the chemist's grain of wheat, an act not in the spirit of righteousness is worthless except as a deceiving form.

This accounts for the unrest of millions whose activities are so great, and equally as fruitless, and of the millions more who have turned from the letter because it affords no heart's ease. Had man remained right-

sous, his words would have represented the Father; and every man made righteous, through faith, has spirit and life to his words. The excuse may be placed where it please; but the reason the tens of thousands of ministers and Christian workers are so fruitless in their endeavors is because they are not right up to the standard of the law of right; namely, love. Perfect love hath no torment, has boldness for judgment days. Jesus Christ has shown us what the true element of righteousness is, and how the law can be fulfilled. Life in Christ Jesus, not imputationally, but the life of Jesus imparted to us, makes us free from sin and death, from wrong actions and deadly doings. The church of to-day in many instances is following the spirit of self-interest, and many of its activities lie in that direction. *The spirit of right is opposition to every teaching that makes a man acceptable to God without inward conformity to law.* Antinomianism is outlawed, if it is true, with the faith of an imputed righteousness; there ought to exist a freedom from a sense of wrong-doing to those who do not keep the law, and a sense of purity under violated law. David said, "I love the commandments above gold and precious stones. I will always keep thy law; yea, forever and ever."

I once listened two hours to a renowned Jewish Rabbi, on the subject of "Reformed Judaism." The first hour he pressed home with logic and eloquence

a masterful argument to prove that it was not natural for a good man to love an enemy. He carried his point, and spent the other hour arraigning Christianity because it demanded the impossible, — that we should “love our enemies,” and “bless those who despitefully use us.” Approaching him at the close, I said, “Doctor, you have strengthened my faith in Christianity ; for what it is not natural for mankind to do in its unrighteous state, Jesus can empower men to do by the ‘power that maketh for righteousness.’” He said, “I am glad you believe so ; I wish I could.”

With many, “imputed righteousness ” is exceedingly convenient as they understand it. If good for *some* lack, it is good for a *great* lack, and covers, “once one believes,” all his sins, avoiding the necessity of securing inward conformity to the divine law, and claiming that obedience to the law has been abrogated by faith in Jesus Christ ; but this violates every principle of right authoritatively asserting itself in man’s inmost consciousness. It is not right to knowingly violate law, and no man can be righteous who does it ; hence, the figment of imputed righteousness covering our sins while we continue to believe. Faith and righteousness are inseparable, and to say we sin while we believe is to deny the facts of our inmost nature. No soul can be in a condition to trust God while consenting to obey sin. We might as well have no law to keep, as to have the most perfect law, and

be unable to keep it. Christ came "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled *in us*." Abraham believed in the righteousness of God, and surrendered himself to be conformed to it. He showed his faith by obedience to God's law, and was called "the friend of God." He who believes he cannot be right is absolutely powerless in the presence of wrong.

What less could be expected of a Judge combining the office of Saviour but that his salvation would comport with the standard by which he was to judge those he saves. By the law we shall be judged. "As many as have sinned under law shall be judged by the law; for not the hearers of a law are righteous before God, but the doers of the law shall be accounted righteous." This is the divine standard of human conduct and obedience with the irrevocable condition of righteousness. When we fall below this, an inner voice tells us our welfare depends upon a return to obedience to the standard God has written before Sinai, on the indestructible papyrus of our spirit-nature.

This righteousness is by faith, and is "*the righteousness of God*." Perhaps this term has had much to do with the idea that it is imputed, and especially as it is "through faith." Let us for a moment look at it. What is the righteousness of God? Something he can bestow to another; certainly not in the sense of imparting his own personal righteousness, and yet

a gift from God. Paul had it; "not having a righteousness of my own," was his statement in contrast with "the righteousness of God by faith." He was not seeking to set up his own righteousness, by trying to keep the letter of the law, but to exalt "the righteousness of God." It is not the product of obedience, but that which produces it. We are judicially righteous by faith, being freely justified by faith apart from works, "from all things from which ye could not be justified in the law of Moses." We are made righteous by God imparting righteousness to us by, or in response to, our faith. We continue righteous by keeping the law of obedience; for when he imparts righteousness, nothing short of conformity to its law can retain it. If righteousness was not the rectitude of a living substance, a mere imputed "standing," there would be no constitutional need of obedience. If we are only to be judicially accounted righteous, on the ground of the righteousness of another, and that is all that is involved, we might have little concern for law; but if the moral law is an expression in form of that which governs us, to break it is to disarrange ourselves: and no man can destroy himself and be righteous. A man who is made righteous has no plea of inability to offer for not doing right. If we could convince ourselves that our wrong-doing was simply inability, we would be relieved of blame.

Imparted righteousness relieves us of the strain

of a constant endeavor to "try to do right" without a right spirit to do right with. How many clamor for a form and for the letter; in a spirit of unrighteousness they enter into all kinds of lawlessness to secure obedience to the letter. If we have a right spirit renewed within us, we will walk easily in the way of God's commandments. It is a delusion and a cause for confirmed unbelief for the Church to be constantly demanding obedience to the rules of right living, without first securing the rectitude of the spirit that prompts our actions. Only to a righteous soul can God reveal the method of life well pleasing to him. The incoming of real righteousness would dispense with the most of the life that now is, and introduce a reign of peace, love, and good-will to one another; then we would see the coming of "the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."



## IX.

## THE WAY OF FAITH.

The life I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God. — PAUL, *Gal.* ii. 20.

Faith does not create anything or change anything; it simply apprehends what it is, and counts it true. — A. J. GORDON, D.D.

“Faith is not an arbitrary gift of God, but a faculty of the soul.”

THE relation of faith to the salvation of the soul is so vital, it is very essential it be properly understood. False theories concerning it paralyze the possibilities of men. The principle of faith is intuitive, — *man believes.*

Faith has to do with the unseen. An unaided faith leads to superstitions by perverted concepts of truth. The faith principle puts man searching for a true object in which he can securely repose; there are millions of seekers after God, if haply they may find him. A feeling pervades human nature, that some one ought to be known, who would inspire the attributes of our being with sufficient confidence, to secure the obedience we feel ought to be bestowed upon a greater than ourselves, for our highest development. Faith assures us we are not a final cause, and that another is entitled to our deepest reverence. We

are worshippers. The bestowment of the faith principle is a creative act, and abides ; "And now abides faith," says the great Apostle Paul.

If faith abides, it must have an abiding *object*. However the race received it, the feeling is universal that an object outside ourselves deserves our homage and worship. Our aspirations demand such an object. Think as we will, we have attributes no materialistic philosophy can account for, that cannot be satisfied with the things that are seen. An Infinite Spirit is necessary to explain the aspirations of the soul of man. The true and abiding object of our faith is "God manifest in the flesh;" we will never be at rest in any other object. Man will seek until he finds, knock until the door opens, to a true revelation of God by Christ Jesus.

Those who have not now the means of knowing him will ultimately be rewarded with the sight, if they are true to "the light that lighteth every man coming into the world." Though the form may be false, if they fear God, and work righteousness, they are accepted of him. The *principle* of faith is in the race ; the *object* millions have not heard of who are following an inner light with a beautiful faith. Not knowing the source, they follow the light until they find him.

*The unchanging object for our faith is Jesus, both Lord and Christ.*

*The reason for our faith is the revelation of God.*

God has revealed himself through natural and supernatural processes; "for when Gentiles, which have no law, do by *nature* the things of the law, these, having no law, are a law unto themselves, in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts." Here is the ground of obligation to believe; and destiny hinges as surely on believing or not believing this law, as though Jesus with his own lips had uttered it to them. It is not necessary to establish the fact that the Bible is the revelation of God to set up responsibility for non-belief. The inner revelation through his Spirit makes the act of belief or non-belief necessary; and as the revelation is moral, choice is involved in its acceptance or rejection, and destiny results from the choice. All intelligent beings believe or doubt revealed truth. Such a revelation as the Bible affords increases our light, and enhances the moral value of our determinations.

Before the New Testament was written, Jesus said of the Jews, "If I had not come and spoken to them they had not had sin." His speaking to them was a revelation of God, — the fulfilment of types and prophecies, and their destiny hinged upon their acceptance or rejection of him and his sayings. The revelations by the Spirit of the nature and import of the sayings of Christ are a basis of faith. Yea, while the testimony of fallible witnesses is not sufficient ground for

believing without any spiritual illumination, yet we are not to despise testimonies and witnesses to his inner revelations of himself, lest in doing so we reject Him of whom they are witnesses. So faith has for its reason the revelation of God in *Nature*; the revelation of God in *his Word*; the revelation of God in *Jesus Christ*; the revelation of God *through his Spirit*. No soul is without some of these reasons for believing God. Many have been favored with them all. The subjective act of faith is threefold:—

The *intellect* perceives the object as a reality to be obtained.

The *affections* embrace the object thus presented.

The *will* yields the being to its influence.

We cannot believe an unreasonable thing. There is nothing in the religion of Jesus that is *contrary* to reason. We cannot believe two moral opposites are the same. We are not responsible for the unrevealed, and are under no obligation to believe anything until we possess a mental concept of the reality. An unrevealed thing cannot have any claim upon our determinations; “but those *things which are* revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law.” God must open the eyes of our understanding before he can require obedience or faith. I must *see* the truth, I must *desire* it, I must *yield* to obey it, before the act of faith is complete. I must embrace it clearly, lovingly, before it can be mine.

Webster defines faith as "the belief in the facts and truth of the Scriptures, with a practical love of them, especially that confiding and affectionate belief in the person and work of Christ which affects the character and life, and makes a man a true Christian, called a practical, evangelical, or saving faith."

The Scripture says, "Faith is the giving substance to things hoped for, the proving of things not seen." The faith principle and the act of faith are different; the one is *intuitional*, the other *volitional*. Many confound the *ability* to believe with the *act* of believing. The ability to believe is the gift of God in the same sense as we possess any other faculty. It is an absolute impossibility to be a believer and an unbeliever concerning the same thing at the same time; the *choice* essential to the act of believing is wholly self-caused. When the disciples prayed, "Lord, increase our faith," they were reproved for not possessing more faith, and told how their faith was to be increased; namely, by serving faithfully with what they already possessed, and that obedience is essential to an increase of faith (Luke xvii. 7-10). Not by divine bestowment, but by obedience to divine command.

The blacksmith has the ability to strike the blows that develop his muscle. He does not kneel down by his anvil to pray for an increase of muscle, he strikes the iron to-day, to-morrow, many days, faithfully, constantly; and upon his arm is found, not a muscle

merely, — he had that when he was a day old, — but an *increased one*. Such a one is not constantly praying for more muscle, but is *working and eating*. He who has faith will work, or his faith dies ; he who works increases his faith. Give me the measure of a man's muscular development, and I will tell you the character of the blows he can wield ; tell me what he eats, and I can tell you the possibilities of his development.

Jesus marvelled at one man's faith, and chided another's unbelief. He clearly taught that faith was conditioned upon man's own choice, and he was responsible for unbelief. To make God the author of faith by specific gift, and then make it a condition of salvation, would make God fulfil the conditions he requires of his subjects. Quesnel says, " Faith puts the almighty power of God into the hands of men, whereas unbelief appears to tie up even the hands of the Almighty." Jesus expected his own kinsmen, by virtue of his words and works, to believe him ; when through unbelief they spurned him, *he marvelled*. If it was his province to impart faith, he certainly would have known whether he had done so or not ; if he did not, and they were dependent upon him for its bestowment, the farce of his surprise at their non-possession lays him liable to hypocrisy.

The dying need of the church of to-day is not a whining cry for more faith, but a loving obedience to God's commands. Thousands in the church to-day are pray-

ing for more faith who, if they would arise, and put forth the effort that lies in their power, would soon put a conquered world at our adorable Saviour's feet.

"With the heart, man [lovingly and willingly] believeth unto righteousness," or right being; but he cannot believe in a being or truth of whom he has not heard, and unless quickened by the Spirit, man's dormant nature would invariably urge the rejection of a being who would change the whole scope of one's activities, and direct them in a channel of service the very opposite to his former choices and actions.

A Christian's faith, linked to God's love and power, makes everything in the promises of God possible.

It, —

"Laughs at impossibilities,  
And cries, 'It shall be done.'"

We are to believe the *message*, whoever may be the messenger. If a telegram comes to me from a friend, bearing important news, I would be foolish to cast it away because I did not like the appearance of the messenger, or his mode of delivering it. The messenger must commend himself to me by what he is himself, but the message must not be ignored, lest I do my friend an injustice that costs me his friendship.

It is what the promise contains we appropriate, and not the promise itself. "All *things* whatsoever;" the "all things" are made ours by an appropriating faith. The *motive* power of an evangelical faith is love; it is

warmed and intensified, but a heart burning with love to God. How easy to trust or obey a being we love.

Faith is always in the present tense. Unbelief, its opposite, postpones all good ; it paralyzes man's powers, gives sorrow, misery, woe, relentings, repentings. Joyless days and sleepless nights, a pang for a song, a frown for a smile, hate for love, broken harps hung silent on weeping willows, the voice of holy prayer hushed, a prey to fear. No rainbow of promise amid sin, anguish, and death. How many gates of life it has closed, how many feet it has removed from the narrow way, how many homes it has blighted, how many poisoned arrows it has thrown! It conquered Adam in Eden, the Israelites at Kadesh Barnea, David on the housetop, the Jews in the presence of a loving Saviour, Ananias and Sapphira in the church. It seals the Word of God, shuts out the light of heaven, opens the gates of perdition, always "preparing linen, and a hundred pounds of precious ointment" to *embalm a living Christ*. Gives to life a shade of night, and to death a sting.

Not so with faith. Chains, prisons, bonds, stripes, and even death may await the faithful one. The ugly scars, the marks of the dying of the Lord Jesus, may be deep, yet the inner prison becomes an upper room, with its vision of God and eternal realities. Faith waits with expectant Mary at early dawn for her risen Lord.



One of the most pernicious errors that has attached itself to the truth is the declaration we should *witness to our faith*. Many are missing the subjective work of the Spirit by being taught this fallacy, both in regeneration and sanctification.

#### WITNESSING TO YOUR FAITH,

the nice distinction between believing what God says, and knowing what God does, is ignored, *and the real act of faith* is omitted. This point has the sanction of some of the prominent workers in the church, and has produced a spiritless class of witnesses to regeneration and holiness, who dryly and with theoretical clearness profess spiritual experiences they do not possess, *and never stir up any other soul to possess it*, universally become legalists on spiritual things, devoid of love, fanatical, censorious, making light of the striving to "enter in" of others, and usually do violence to the experience they profess to have.

This fallacy is all the more dangerous as it is supposed by its advocates to be the essence of true faith. They are taught, and they themselves say, "I have no consciousness of any experience, but I am taking it by faith." "God says so, and I am believing his word." Let us look at such statements a moment. Their danger lies in the fact that they

are half-truths, and if the soul would not rest there, no special harm would be done. But first days, then weeks, then months intervene, and they keep "testifying to their faith" till they slip over *to the testimony to the fact without any fact to testify to*. They do not say, "I have sought the new birth, and have found it." This they dare not do and be true to self; nor, "I have found the glorious experience of perfect love," but always relate the processes up to the point, and say, "I just took it by faith," or, "I am standing by faith." *Now, standing by faith is neither the work of regeneration nor holiness*, and if you ask them what it was they "took" by faith, they will say whatever the experience sought; then ask them if they have it, and they will say, "I believe I have." Now, can you not plainly see that this experience has no subjective side to it? This faith has no end to it; the act is not complete; they have not received "the end of their faith." The end of your faith is the salvation of the soul, and, if full salvation is sought, the full salvation of your soul. They have not *received* the salvation, they have *believed* it; and the salvation is a non-reality because the act of *receiving* is a non-reality, *which receiving is a conscious act*. No one can receive a nonentity. A reality to be received must be perceptible to the one that receives it; and how logical, when one, instead of "believing that you *receive* it,

and you shall *have* it," and then testifying to the truth of God's promise *from a consciousness* that you have it, stops seeking according to Christ ("He that seeketh findeth"), and testifies to faith in what God says, goes on without it. Faith in the truthfulness of God's word is essential to any degree of salvation, but is not sufficient for salvation. We must not only believe the promise is true, and that "Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it," but we must receive the thing his promise embraces. A hungry man may have faith in the promiser, and his promise of a hearty meal, and may come where the meal is spread, and hear others talk of how sweet the food is to their taste, and believe them; but will it satisfy his hunger, or make him a reliable witness to the preciousness of the feast to say, "I believe I am eating and being filled; I don't *feel* any different than when I came, but I am resting on the promise, and will let the feeling take care of itself"? What a witness to the feast, as the guests gathered in the parlor, and all wanted to praise the bounteous giver! One witness says, "Oh, how my soul has feasted on thy word!" another, "The entrance of thy word giveth light;" another, "With joy do we draw water out of the wells of salvation;" the witness to his faith, "I am standing on your promise." "Did you eat to the full?" "I am clinging by faith." "How did you enjoy the feast?" "I

believe what the Promiser says." Brethren, beloved of God, it is time this stopped. This "believe you've got it and you have it" craze has flooded our churches with unconverted members, and it is doing the same with the work of holiness, born, I fear, of the same spirit to *count* success. Hold these souls to the crucifying point of *receiving*, where unbelief must die. How carnality dodges it! Anything to let them off from the real crucifixion. I haven't got it, but I will believe I have it. I'll testify to my faith, and stand with the witnesses. O my God, presumption takes the place of faith! A profession of thy work not manifest is received instead of thy sanctifying power; and as a result, our meetings are hindered by spiritless, inconsistent witnesses, who persistently profess what they do not possess, on the plea of standing by faith, and hinder the real work of the Holy Spirit. *This is the main cause of the awful task to secure genuine conversions in revival meetings, and resorting to any method of securing professions other than receiving "the spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba Father," and if any more of it goes on in connection with the work of holiness, dry conventionalities will take the place of Holy Ghost testimonies.*

While the act of faith involves choice, it in itself accomplishes nothing spiritual. It only makes it possible for the Spirit to accomplish his work. Faith

holds us in God's hands until the likeness is so perfect we have no desire to be removed from him.

“But can it be that I should prove  
Forever faithful to thy love,  
From sin forever cease?  
And I who dare thy Word believe,  
Without committing sin shall live,  
Shall live to God at last?”

## X.

## INFIRMITIES VS. SINS.

Sin is the transgression of the law. — *1 John* iii. 4.

For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. — *Heb.* iv. 15.

But those mistakes that come from undeveloped conditions and from limited capacities, those errors which certainly do materially interfere with moral perfection and full allegiance to God's idea of rectitude, are of the nature of infirmities. — HENRY WARD BEECHER.

There are old residents in this country who are by no means favorites with me, and I cut their acquaintance as much as possible; such as ignorance, forgetfulness, misjudgment, error, inadvertence, and a large family by the name of ignorance. In fact I repeatedly cast my vote for their exclusion; but they insist they have a right to remain, since no statute lies against them. They say they are grossly confounded with an odious foreigner called sin, who slightly resembles them in moral character. I must confess that close observation, extended through several years, demonstrates the justice of the plea; hence I live in peace with these old citizens, but do not delight in their company. — DANIEL STEELE'S *Milestone Papers*, p. 284.

FOR the want of proper discrimination between infirmities and sins, much of the misunderstanding concerning holiness has existed. There has not been that careful discrimination between voluntary and responsible acts, and involuntary and irresponsible acts. Ignorance and failures growing out of physical and mental weaknesses have been classed as sins, and a type of perfection of conduct has been required of

professors of holiness that is ungracious and unscriptural.

Mental and physical disorders over which the will has no control assert themselves, and are manifest in our conduct. The individual is conscious of having no responsibility in the matter, while others not possessing the same disorders are led to judge the acts from their conception of the measure of responsibility they have concerning the same acts. This has caused a fearful amount of misjudging, and charges of blameworthiness. Our mental operations are frequently the results of unconscious influences operating upon us; and we decide many things without judgment, because others influence us in that direction, and see no reason why we should not do as they do. To others who know better, such acts would be wrong. After reflection, correct teaching, and better environment we may see our error and its evil influences, and cease what we thought was the proper thing to do. The spirit of holiness demands that we "confess our faults." *An infirmity becomes sin when we detect our error, and choose to continue it.* No condemnation can exist until we see our fault, and are capable of correcting it. As long as the will is not involved in a wrong choice, there can be no blameworthiness; and while the heart has no desire for an impure object, there can be no defilement, whatever error we may fall into. Men of weak minds yield to

those of stronger minds with an impression they are voluntarily choosing their own path, and fall into many harmful errors concerning the most precious truths, such as, "The coming of our Lord," "Divine healing," "Sleep of the dead," "Conditional immortality," etc. They are all the more strenuous in the dissemination of their views, because they have not seen the difference between their (or another's) interpretation of certain passages of Scripture. They feel they must defend the Word of God from misunderstanding, and create new forms; separate themselves unto themselves, and sever very tender ties, under the delusion they must be true to their beliefs. A holy heart detecting his error will abandon it, and humbly admit it. A fanatic will never do so.

The discovery that one has been in error does not produce condemnation, but humiliation and regret. Many have done harm unintentionally, who cannot recall their influence, when they meant to do good. This will apply to the question of dress, church relationship, attitude toward those ministers who oppose them, and many other questions where the judgment is wrong, though the motive is pure, and the desire is to correct an evil, or what is to them an evil.

A false interpretation of God's Word will not be corrected by abuse *on either side*, but by truth. He who is led to see his error, and continues in it, must be a fanatic of the worst kind, capable of crimes in the name of conscience.



Many who are conscious of infirmities of the physical and intellectual powers, classify them with sins, for want of proper instruction, and thereby reject the glorious doctrine of salvation from all sin in this life. Out of this apparently contradictory state of things many have been brought, and a harassing, unfounded doubt of divine favor removed forever, by a proper consideration of this theme.

Infirmities exist under the law of necessity, and are unavoidable. Sins are voluntary. No power in the universe can make a man sin against his will.

The redemptive scheme proposes to redeem the entire man, but intellectual and physical defects must come under their own laws. Intellects are not purified, but illuminated. Our bodies are not cleansed, but quickened, either by healing or resurrection. A perfect intellect or body is an impossibility in this life. Some infirmities of the mind may be removed in this life, or, more correctly speaking, some results of an infirm mind may be overcome by a better reason, a larger knowledge and clearer light. The spirit-nature has one end to serve; viz., *to love*. One may be as true as the needle to the pole in regard to his *choosing* the right up to his clearest convictions, and yet he may often break the perfect law without intent or consent on his part, by a disordered condition of his mental nature. One of the weaknesses of the high priest of the old dispensation was that his own ignorance

hindered his being touched with the feeling of our infirmities. Not so with our Great high priest. He knows the difference between an evil choice and an ignorance, and his feelings are touched sympathetically when we err, and are humiliated over it; a discrimination, by virtue of his limitations, a human priest could not make, and no doubt frequently rendered unjust judgment.

One of the things that good people have to suffer, is the judgment growing out of unfavorable appearances, or unwise acts, that can never be adjusted in this life. Here is occasion for that charity that "thinketh no evil."

The Scriptures distinguish between infirmities and sins, between infirmities of the *flesh* and *mind*. In Luke xiii. 11-12, is found the case of a woman "which had a spirit of *infirmity* eighteen years." Christ made her whole. She was "bowed together." In John v. 5, "A certain man was there which had an *infirmity* thirty and eight years." He also was made whole, but had this infirmity by sinning against his body, and was strictly commanded to "sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon thee."

Paul, writing to the Romans (vi. 19), said: "I speak after the manner of men because of the *infirmity* of your flesh." They had reduced their physical life by all manner of "uncleanness, and to iniquity unto iniquity," until they were at a low ebb, and were inca-

pacitated from rendering such service as a better-preserved, less-abused physical nature could render. He recognized their weakness, and the relative mental deficiency, and treated them accordingly. A lesson for the church not to expect perfection in conduct or thought in those whose mental and physical life has been under vicious influences. Here is room for a charity that "hopeth all things." The removing of the guilt and the cleansing of our natures from the defilement of sin may be instantaneous, but the element of time enters into the mental and physical restoration. Violations of physical laws may result unconsciously even in a pure individual. As a natural course for a better state of things, Paul recommends them to "yield their members as servants to righteousness unto holiness."

Paul himself mentioned his physical infirmities. He says: "Ye know how, through *infirmity of the flesh*, I preached the gospel unto you at the first." Conybeare and Howson say: "Although it was sickness (as you know) which caused me to preach the glad tidings to you at my first visit, yet you neither scorned nor loathed me because of the *bodily infirmity* which was my trial." He also calls it "a thorn in the flesh." Of the Galatians he says, "You would have torn out your own eyes and given them to me." Why was he "contemptible in appearance"? Why did he boast that he wrote one small epistle with his "own

hand," if not that his eyes were radically diseased, and his body weak, and physical infirmities pressed him sore? Would he glory in an avoidable defect, after thrice praying for its removal? much less, would he glory in sin? Even this giant intellect, prosecuting the great work of the ministry, finds mental infirmities to hinder his work, — "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair." Who for a moment will think the Spirit has left him during those times? Could he not prompt him and prevent his being "troubled" and "perplexed"? Yes, as a matter of power he could. As a matter of wisdom, nay. These very troubles and perplexities are disciplinary and helpful. Jesus said, "Let not your *heart* be troubled." And when it comes to spiritual things, the Spirit is promised to help our *infirmity* by illumination, so we can pray according to the will of God. But he wisely chooses to leave us to ourselves under different laws, to learn wisdom by the things we suffer.

We are to have unbounded charity for one another's infirmity. "We, then, that are strong, ought to bear the *infirmities* of the weak, and not to please ourselves." Sin needs rebuke, lest the sinner be lost; infirmities to be patiently borne with, lest we drive a weak one out of the way.

A yearly atonement was made by the high priest "for himself and for the *errors* of the people." It was

of these errors the Psalmist said, "Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret [unknown] faults." For these "errors" and "secret faults" the high priest offered blood; type of the blood of Jesus that covers unconditionally all our errors and secret faults. For this we pray always, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." Not that they must come and confess to us. Many unwittingly trespass against us, but we forgive without conditions, because it was unintentional. Intentional trespass could not be adjusted by any such process on the part of the guilty party. Having done a thing ignorantly, involving the well-being of another, the law requires that reparation be made as far as possible for the evil resulting from the trespass. Wilful sin has to be confessed in detail, covering the act committed.

The two extremes must be avoided, — the one, that we cannot be saved from sin in this life, many of these very passages being quoted as proof; the other, that because we are saved from sin, we cannot conscientiously pray the Lord's Prayer. In the one instance the blessed doctrine of a full and free salvation from all sin, by entire consecration and faith in the all-cleansing blood of the Lamb, is ignored; in the other, a type of perfection is taught that is unscriptural, unreasonable, and leads to the most subtle Pharisaism.

May the blessed Holy Spirit teach us to discriminate between *infirmities* for which we are to have charity, and *sin* which must not go unpunished, lest a greater evil overtake the transgressor.

We must watch, lest we excuse ourselves from known duty on account of them, and encourage self-indulgence which can only have one end. Our limited knowledge ought to be a spur to waste no time, but study to be workmen approved unto God, that needeth not to be ashamed. Jesus can "keep us from falling" now, and will present us "faultless" in the presence of his glory. Even so, Amen.

## XI.

## LOVE THE SPIRIT OF OUR RELIGION.

A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another ; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. — *John* xiii. 34.

All moral action flows from the love of God gently and quickly, as light flows from the sun. — FICHTE.

Jesus, confirm my heart's desire,  
To work, and speak, and think for thee.  
Still let me guard the holy fire,  
And still stir up thy gift in me.  
Ready for all thy perfect will,  
My acts of faith and love repeat ;  
Till death thy endless mercies seal  
And make the sacrifice complete.

JOHN WESLEY.

THERE can never be harmony among Christians without some common centre of attraction, which is obtainable by all ; for no religion is divine that excludes any one from its provisions. Because of man's organic defects since the Fall, he is incapable of possessing or appreciating many things, any one of which, if made the centre around which society must revolve, would exclude the many. Music, art, architecture, language, literature, science, philosophy, etc., cannot be appreciated by the masses. To some, the squalling of

a flock of geese is more attractive than the sweetest human voice; or a pile of rocks than the cathedral at Milan; while the exquisite blending of colors by the greatest artist is but the work of a dauber to their color-blind eyes.

*All men possess ability to love*, and to do so is the supremest act they are capable of, and he is the greatest man who loves the most. The exaltation of the intellect above the affections, the cultivation of the intellect under natural processes, and the neglect of the enlargement of the affections under a supernatural process, are the bane of the Christianity of to-day. We want no less of the intellectual, but more of the heart; indeed, we would have clearer intellects if we had purer hearts. The endeavor to see spiritual truth by methods of reasoning that are revealed to a pure heart, is the source of various systems of thought that love would instantly destroy. Just in proportion as the heart has become right, has the intellect discerned divine truth.

A loving heart operating through a poorly balanced intellect is not as detrimental to truth, as a cold reasoner without the inspiration of revealed truth, logically stating his keenest perceptions of what he believes truth is. Christian history warrants the statement, that the largest intellectual development has come through right affections operating upon a willing mind. No other part of our being opens to us the realm of the



spiritual, and gives such spheres of operation to the intellect, as those that love opens to us. It is common to find great intellect working on material forms, exceedingly circumscribed, that, had the heart been open to God, would have lived in realms of thought and life transcendently grander than the butterfly is to the crawling worm. If ability permits, the intellect, through a long and tedious process, is made to discover some things that love instantly sees. While Seneca was being tutored in schools of thought so devoid of love that his three great teachers never mentioned their own mothers in the numerous volumes they wrote, Paul was being taught at the feet of Gamaliel the barren traditions of men for the commandments of God. Seneca seeking if haply he might find; Saul trying to establish righteousness by conformity to law. The one found peace with God by a slow process, the other instantly by a revelation of Jesus Christ. One wrote morals worth imitating; the other wrote revelation that opens eternal verities to the heart's love. Through a long, and to many an impossible, process of reasoning, some things concerning God may be revealed; *but the satisfying revelations of God come through a purified affection*, and this is possible — yea, promised — to all believers. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." To make himself most known, God must pursue the course through which the greatest number can know

him; and as he desires all should know him, and thereby obtain eternal life, the avenue of knowledge must be through something we can be or do, or both. He who loves God knows him. We frequently confound joy, which is an emotion contained in one's self, with love, which is a desire for an object outside of ourselves. When we say we love an object or being, we mean we affectionately seek that object, and find our happiness in possessing it. Love cannot live without another living object to support it, and love is never at its best until it is joined with other loving beings, to bestow some benefactions upon others who need them. *He who makes self the object of his love, has no object worthy, or able, to develop his affectional nature.* Mr. Herbert Spencer in his *Data of Ethics* says, "that no man can achieve his own personal happiness without promoting the happiness of all others." Here is an object worthy a lifetime of service, that reflects more favorably upon the one who does it, than to be self-centred, and self-destroyed as a consequent; for we were not made to be so.

An unloving heart is a dead one, and casts its death-shadows over the entire being. The object of our love must be abiding if our love abides. The natural limits of our *human* love make it impossible for it to satisfy; when closest bound it is instantly severed by inevitable causes. The command to love God with all the heart, and our neighbor as ourselves, is not ar-

bitrary, but essential to our highest good. *He* is the only being who can supply eternally the reason for being loved, and beings like ourselves attributively, the only channel through which this love can be manifested. We are like what we love. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so he is."

The intellect possesses no such power over our being as the affections. Solomon said, "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." Frequently against our best judgment and our clearest convictions our hearts carry us after the objects they desire, when we know to possess them will be detrimental to our best interests.

When we say we love God, we mean we passionately desire him. Among the many peculiarities manifest by such a soul will be a desire to be *alone* with him. The outside reward in effective service comes from closest communion. The service is the place to express love, not receive it. "He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty." Where love exists, secret communion will be sought under the greatest of difficulties. No sense of duty drives a lover to seek the presence of the one he loves ; nothing is more unpleasant than to be assured an interview is impossible. No one can meet the one he supremely loves without an inspiration filling his entire being, and such never talk of coldly "loving from principle." Indeed, there

is no principle worth mentioning until love dominates the being.

We admire everything in the nature and character of God when we love him, and seek to be like him. This thought involves the question of being, not service. We do not think we are rendering service when we admire holiness, truth, righteousness, power, wisdom, purity, humility, compassion, and love. If we had no attribute of nature to respond to these attributes in him, we could not admire them. We are endowed attributively with the same characteristics under conditional limitations. To love him puts our whole being planning to be like him. We loathe all impurities in ourselves and others; we love truth, righteousness, wisdom, holiness, and are made wise unto salvation; we love humanity with the same compassion. If we have his nature, we cannot but feel his love. Our life is not a sentiment costing us nothing but mouthing words, it is "a living sacrifice" to demonstrate the nature and character of divine love.

The value of the Scriptures with one who loves God is one of the vital questions of our times. An intelligent, loving heart distinguishes between the letter and the writer. If God has asked others to record his thoughts in human form, whose hands are hardly legible, and whose figures are faulty, it would militate nothing against it, if the thoughts intended to be expressed were clearly perceived. Another has said,

“Every attempt to bring spiritual mysteries within purely intellectual apprehension, is to encroach upon the function of the heart as the best interpreter of God.” When we coldly look at it to frame it into a system of logical statement it congeals us, when with a broken heart, it flows warm like a gulf stream to take our sin away. Love feeds on the heart of God, whatever may be the form of his coming to the heart. No book or speaker can tell me what the heart of God feels toward me. *He must shed it abroad by his Spirit.* Scholars may wrangle over chronologies, style of authors, form of expression; but he who wrote it has proven his relation to it, and is beyond the reach of criticism. History may not be accurately stated, miracles may remain unproved to many minds; but as long as this book tells its tale of love, and proves its genuineness in satisfying the heart, no other book can displace it. We rest in his love; confident explanations will come in due time. The great truth remains unchanged that “God is love,” and he who loved us and gave himself for us, having regenerated and sanctified our hearts, has given sufficient proof of his ability to perform any other miracle recorded in his Word. He who has not felt the omnipotence of love may doubt God’s power in nature; but he who has been transformed from selfishness to love cannot doubt the lesser miracle. Whoever has heard God speak, though no

sound invaded the stillness or form appeared in view, finds what he said in his Word, and what he speaks to the heart, are one.

The philosophy of true Christian fellowship is love. "See how these brethren love one another," is the old cry. One may dwell in the region of lofty speculation, and charm with the flights of imagination, or he may allure to a non-reality; but the story of a manifested love, who has not felt its truth? Two or more individuals loving God are united to one another in proportion to the measure of their love to him. He who loves God most, loves humanity most.

Love being spirit, it must have a form through which it is outwardly manifested. It is that of rectitude. It weighs motive, and measures conduct. It is always manifest where right exists. What folly this incessant prayer for love without a proper nature to reveal it! Rectitude is the law through which it operates. He who is not right cannot really love, and he who loves, loves right. Only as a matter of intelligent adjustment does he care who is, or is not, on the side of right. God is, and the loving man sides with God, and any lingering fear to do so, is positive proof such a one's love is not made perfect. "Perfect love casteth out fear."

Much of the pusillanimous sentimentality called love in the home and church of to-day is a mocking, hypocritical excuse for the genuine article. One who loves

me will do right to me though the heavens fall ; not from a sense of duty, but paramount desire. Whatever his temptation, if he loves me he will do me no ill for "love worketh no ill to his neighbor." This is the basis of our boldness in judgment. The Judge of all the earth shall do right. Love manifests itself through righteousness. Love never sets up intellectual difficulties. He that loveth not, knoweth not God — for God is love. Having made love the avenue of his revelation, nothing else will open the avenue.

If learning was the means, the masses would never know him ; or anything else but love. The evidence of the divinity of Christ is not through logical processes but the revelation of his love to the heart. There is only a theoretic Trinity in the mind until the heart reveals Jesus as both Lord and Christ.

Unitarianism, which is the highest product of refined human love manifest through well-developed intellect can never save the world, because it shuts out the greatest objective manifestation of the true character of God to the world ; viz., the sacrificial expression of divine love manifested on Calvary. Jesus said "greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." This is the highest form of human love ; but "God commended his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

Love has an eternal future before it. Tongues shall

cease, prophecies shall fail, knowledge shall vanish away — love “never faileth.” Under the law of love, angels remained sinless from the beginning. Heaven will be restored when love again reigns. To be perfect in love here is to have a foretaste of heaven. When Christ said, “Love one another as I have loved you,” he gave us the last possible command. It includes and fulfils all law everywhere. As whatever one may possess that is beautiful cannot make a man a Christian without love, so the only progress Christianity is making in the world can be measured by the amount of love manifested. People are being made bigots by theories, pharisees by formalism, zealots by ecclesiasticism, fanatics by emotions, and Christians by love. If love prevails, many theories will vanish, Pharisaism will die, ecclesiasticism will be the servant, and not the lord, of God’s heritage, and fanaticism will be replaced by holy enthusiasm. Love must be manifested for selfishness to be convicted.

How am I to know it pays to be unselfish unless I can see the glory accruing to an unselfish being? This is what Christ meant when he said, “Ye are the light of the world;” the world is to see in us the true nature of Christian love, “that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and lovest them as thou hast loved me,” said Christ. Our love to each other when “made perfect in one,” will reveal to the world the fact that “God



sent his Son ;” and nothing else will ever conquer its selfishness. Jesus Christ demonstrated that a life constrained by divine love is the only complete life, and just in the degree that love does not actuate us, in that degree we set up disharmonies in our own life, and relatively in that of others ; and that all the suffering consequent upon resisting selfishness only enhances the glory of the character that passes through it. The idea that the cross was a commercial transaction, exchanging qualities to pay debts, may answer the cold logic of theologians, but cannot open the sealed fountains of human hearts ; but if Calvary means that love makes its own sacrifice in proportion to its richness and fulness, as an expression of its nature and character, and that divine love must show its divinity by the character of its bestowments, God’s gift of his “only begotten Son” is a fitting expression of the being he claims to be, and the demand of recognition as rightful Sovereign of the universe. If the greatest is to show his greatness by the largest service, a rule the Saviour himself taught, and love always bestows the richest gift, then his claims upon me are not established by prerogative, but by the pre-eminence of nature, manifest by the pre-eminent gift. A selfish heart burns under the flame of a pure love. Churchianity crucified Jesus because of the wonderful, clearly revealed contrast between self-righteousness consisting in petty doings, and the unselfish gift of the entire

being to carry out a plan of love. The same spirit prevails to-day. Calvary makes selfishness more sinful in proportion to the love of its sacrifice to that of any other love. We acknowledge with Paul, Christ's pre-eminent place, because Calvary draws our vision that way; the pre-eminence of its sacrifice proves the pre-eminence of his loving nature. He who desires pre-eminent place among his fellows, has a method declared here, based on an unshaken foundation to rest upon, which will secure an abiding that nothing can remove. Had Jesus not been under the perfect sway of sacrificial love, he would easily have been crowned a King among men; but because he would crucify the world in men, they crowned him with thorns, mocked his kingship, and crucified him. Time has rolled on, kingdoms have arisen and fallen, dynasties have perished, human fame has burst like a bubble, the proud, haughty monarch of to-day has been humbled in the dust on the morrow, but the Lover of men is "King, Immortal, Invisible, the only Potentate," and all who suffer with him are heirs to his kingdom, and are kings unto God. The giant intellect has been lost in the unwritten history of the past; the mighty architect has died, burying his designs with him; the great musician, in his mad frenzy because the instrument would not chord with the inner strains of music, has left his piece unrendered; the eloquent voice swaying thousands has been hushed forever;—but the act

of love, and the one who loves, can never die, and can never be separated. Love never dies. He who loves lives. He who loves much, lives much. He who loves with all his heart lives forever.

## XII.

### LIKENESS UNTO HIMSELF BY CONFORMITY TO HIS IMAGE.

We shall be like him. — *1 John* iii. 2.

His is the human life which does justice to the idea of humanity. —  
PHILLIPS BROOKS.

I looked, and lo! a Lamb stood on Mount Zion, and with him, a hundred and forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. —  
JOHN THE REVELATOR.

For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son. — *Rom.* viii. 29.

Two words in this verse have been the battle-ground of much discussion for centuries past ; viz., “foreknow” and “predestinate.” From this discussion has come many foolish teachings, and earnest souls have been led away from the truth into innumerable fallacies, well-nigh costing them their faith in God. Two theories have gained prominence. The first, that God has from all eternity foreknown and predetermined all things that have been, now are, or ever will be, and that all destiny, having been determined by him, is for his glory, whether men are saved or lost. From this horrid theory, based upon a false concept of God, the religious world now almost universally revolts, as incompatible with the revelations of God.

The other theory is, that God from all eternity foreknows all things, past, present, and future, his foreknowledge insuring their certainty, but not determining the destiny of the actor related to their fulfilment.

This theory, though more reasonable than the other, cannot be reconciled with contingency and human freedom. The Scriptures reveal an Absolute Being as a whole, with absolute attributes ; but no intelligent being thinks absoluteness implies positive contradictions. There is, or is not, a world of contingencies. If not a contingent world, then there are no originating causes outside of God himself, and he is the cause of sin ; but whenever we can establish the cause for sin beyond the determinations of the one who commits it, we remove the base of responsibility to the primal cause. If there were no contingency there could be no sin, or sin and its synonym evil are eternal.

We deny the eternity of sin ; we think of it only as a possibility after creation. An impossibility with the uncreated ; not even a possibility of its existing until free beings are created. The relation between an absolute free being and a finite free being originates contingencies. If man is free, he can sever his relations. God made man like himself, in nothing more than his freedom. If he knew from all eternity man would sever his relation, he knew *why* he would do it. If he knew *why* before he had created anything, the

cause existed with himself, or a reality is known to God without an existent cause. If sin was an impossibility with the uncreated, then it is contingent upon creation. Sin is volitional, therefore sentient beings are essential to its existence. The volitions of a non-existent sentient being is a nonentity, and God cannot know nonentities. Do we limit his knowledge when we say he cannot know nonentities? No more than we limit his almightiness when we say he cannot make a rebellious spirit holy. If God wills, choice is involved, and choice must be subsequent to the chooser.

He plainly declares in Scripture that his determinations depend upon ours. He cannot contradict himself in the world of matter, mind, or spirit. That a square has four equal sides is a law of his own appointing. That a free being is a fountain of causation in himself is as self-evident. Simple liberty to move in the direction another has marked out is not freedom. If he makes free beings, they must be capable of doing contrary to his law and will. None but a free being could introduce rebellion of known law. Some cause must originate the contrary to God's will. He cannot will good and evil at the same time of the same being. If his volitions are eternal, he has always willed good of all his creatures. It would impeach his wisdom to will good of a being, who from all eternity he knew would "wax worse and worse" from the begin-

ning. However his heart might desire the good of his creature, it would be folly to desire what he knows will never come to pass. Why should he desire what he *knows* never will be?

The will being under the law of liberty, and not of cause and effect, in everything pertaining to destiny, nothing now exists by which any being can determine what the subjective choices of that being shall be.

If God does not determine or will anything now, he never did. To speak of a determined thing, or predestinated things, is to determine or "appoint beforehand with an unchangeable purpose." No doubt, from eternity he "ordained with an unchangeable purpose," and that was not that some would be saved and others lost, but that the race of mankind should be like Jesus.

If God wills anything, it cannot be eternal. A volition must be subsequent to the being that wills it. A volition must have been a nonentity until some being willed it. All volitions involving moral destiny are subjective and self-caused. "The law of cause and effect no more invades the freedom of the human will in the kingdom of grace than it does the divine freedom." If self-caused, they are not related to any cause previously existing. Scripture does not cite to the spiritual destiny of any being before he is. It may, and does, foretell the destiny of individuals re-

ated to the fulfilment of a divine plan, and such individuals are put under the law of constraint until such predictions are fulfilled. God says in Ezek. xxxiii.

13-15 :—

“When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live ; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered ; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it.

“Again, when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die ; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right ;

“If the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life, without committing iniquity ; he shall surely live, he shall not die.”

If, to establish a theory, it is necessarily true that God has no succession of ideas, and determines nothing now, nor wills anything other than it is, it must have been so always. If so always, then any apparent action contrary to his knowledge makes him insincere. Why should he urge a sinner to repent, when he has known from all eternity he would not ; especially when rejecting God's entreaties enhances guilt ? What an impeachment of his moral character, to take any step enhancing guilt ! Volition is necessarily subsequent to the one that willeth. To will is to determine that one of two possible things or events shall be. If Deity is unvolitional, and has no determinations, then another word must be chosen to express his thought in the verse under consideration. To eternally predetermine



is a contradiction. To determine anything now, or back in eternity, involves the non-existence of that which is determined before the determiner willed it to be. A destiny eternally foreknown must have eternally existed: if it eternally existed, no being has willed it; and atheism, the logical conclusion of such premises, stands unchallenged.

An eternally foreknown destiny, with no being willing it, is as chilling to the heart of love, as the mountain range whose snow-capped peaks, defying the summer sun, is chilling to a healthy physical organ. If God has determined *one soul* shall be lost, his determination removes the base of responsibility from any subsequent choice to the primal one. If God has no volitions, and has not chosen it, and the choice of an unborn sentient being is a nonentity, to say that he knows the destiny of that soul, is to make God know nonentities, which is as impossible as that God should lie.

This writer is not advocating that God has no volitions, but that he can have none contrary to his moral character and nature; but holds that any volition cannot be coeternal with the one that wills it. To say this creates difficulties does not discourage us in endeavoring to know the truth. Let us wade through ages of difficulties before we believe beyond what is written, or accept a logical contradiction. It is faith to believe what God reveals; it is reason to

accept what is true ; but criminal presumption to found our religious life on absurdities.

I believe God's Word teaches, and it comports with the highest reason, that God has predetermined that the race should be like Jesus, and that any character contrary to his, is an abnormality, and nature has made no provision for such. In the realm of spirit, mind, or matter, there is no law in harmony with un-Christliness ; and the whole redemptive scheme is an active coming of himself into our relations, to bring us back to Christlikeness. It is against his will, contrary to his nature, and a perversity of his law, that a single soul should be eternally lost ; but with sentient, volitional beings, a fountain of causation in themselves, he cannot prevent sin, and its eternal consequent. Had he known any would be lost, it would be superfluous to have planned their salvation. There can be no other doctrine evolved from such premises than a limited atonement and the number of the elect fixed. This conclusion is not reached because God is, or is not, Love, but righteous: His righteousness could not act on lines of insincerity. He could not sincerely call an eternally foreknown lost soul to Christlikeness ; for love would not allow him to enhance such an one's guilt.

God's revealed plan has no class nor personality in it. It is based upon the constitution of human nature and an essential mode of recovery. Any human being

may apply it, and find that He who gave to the world our Christ, can make the world Christian.

His processes undertake nothing less than Christlikeness, and anything short of that will be rejected as blighted wheat is blown away with the chaff. A universal fall, a universal atonement, a universal salvation, a universal redemption, and a universal adaptation in all parts to the divine law, in Christlike completeness, is certainly now God's purpose concerning the race. Should a free being determine, and rightly relate himself to his choosing, every barrier is out of the way of God fulfilling our choice.

That he gave us kingdoms and dominions "in the beginning" was necessary for the activities of our Godlike nature. That we who are the brethren of the First-born will sit with him in co-heirship, floods the promises of God. It would be impossible in the brief space allotted to this theme to meet the difficulties that arise, or emphasize the proofs of this theory from Scripture and some of the ablest thinkers of to-day. I wish to refer now to the facts revealed, and the processess used to bring us to "likeness unto himself."

Man's triune nature is so related constitutionally that no remedial agencies can ignore constitutional law and produce permanent results.

If spirit-life is evolutionary, and the product of antecedent organism, then no creative act was performed

in bringing man into being. Freedom must be created, else necessity universally prevails, outside of God. There can be no freedom without a determining being to reveal it. Darwin sought to establish evolution because he discovered in himself an organism possessing power to create, forgetting that matter, under the law of necessity, possesses no liberty.

Outside the fact of the divine statement that man originally was made in his own image, and the communion recorded between them, one could not easily be impressed with the exalted place human nature occupies in the mind of God ; but when Jesus appears, we see what God intended sinless man should be. God's thought concerning man, before the Fall, is revealed in "the man Christ Jesus." Not that he is only man, but true manhood is united to God, and Jesus says that the Father loves our human nature as he loved his. Human nature has revealed more of the divine nature than all other agencies combined. Christ, the perfect human nature, is ours by a divine process, and that process is the one chosen "before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love. Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself." — *Eph.* i. 4, 5.

The masses of the believers stop at the objective Christ, and believe in him ; but this is only partial gospel. His plan implies likeness unto Himself. Christ

is not merely to be seen historically, intellectually, or objectively ; he is to be "formed within." Spirit-likeness must be created not of necessity, for that would impinge on liberty ; not by evolution, else "a living soul" could evolve "a quickening spirit," — but "through his Spirit," "creating us anew in righteousness."

To say the spirit-likeness to God was a product of the law of necessity would preclude spirit-likeness. The law of necessity never operated as the primal cause of spirit-action. Though damned, I'm free, and only damned because I misused my freedom. The antithesis of this is also true. I am like him, not because I *must* be so, or because *he has made it possible* for me to be so, all of these provisions being necessary, of course ; but, even more, not because I *consent* it should be so, or in my helplessness yield myself over to him, — but conscious I can say, No ; conscious I cannot be put under the law of constraint. Conscious conviction that I ought to be like Jesus is clear. Conscious he wills it, and cannot have his will until I determine ; conscious of the only inevitable, if I refuse ; conscious of weighing carefully results ; conscious that if I deny his will I defy my reason. I withal, weighing all these things in relation to each other, am conscious that nothing is being done, because nothing is being determined. God having already determined from out of eternity, and projected his

purpose by incarnation in time, nothing is determined as far as subjective work is concerned. He tells me, not to mock me, what shall be if I determine in one direction or another ; but he never tells me he knows what my determinations will be. Sovereign of my own destiny, I create that which shall be, and assert the highest prerogative of spirit-nature. He makes what he wills, because I will what he makes. When God revealed his Son in Paul, it was not because demanded in the divine scheme, an irresistible call to fulfil his plan, but he came forth to co-operate with God's because he was "not disobedient unto the heavenly vision," until as the result of conjoint purpose he could say, "For me to live is Christ."

Theologies are but the framing of our concept of God ; remove deductions, preconceived ideas, speculations, and conclusions based upon false premises, and the things that abide are the inwrought realities of the Holy Spirit revealing Christ. Limited love of God within gives us a limited atonement, few saved, little transformation here, and little faith. That soul reads into Scripture what he thinks is the truth, but never mistakes those Scriptures that the Holy Spirit has revealed within. Why? Because with them the Word is made real by producing within what it outwardly expresses. I say produces within, not a consciousness, but a *nature*, of the *manifestation* of which we are conscious. As the selfhood of Christ,

its impingements reveal his presence. This Christ formed within is the process by which we become "partakers of the divine nature," and in their unity set up the relation the Jesus sustains to Jehovah. "I in them, and thou in me," that they may be one in us; "and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." Here a relational love is expressed with coequality. God loves human nature, not because his Son redeemed it; but sent his Son to redeem it because he loved it, and the measure is "as thou hast loved me;" and if he could have his way, we would be filled with the "Spirit of his Son," so that spiritually we should be like him. As the divine order was, first, a nature Godlike, though human, and therefore subject to human limitations, and secondly, a filled human nature; so his order is now, a heavenly generating by the Spirit, and a holy nature filled with the Spirit of holiness.

If the laws governing mind and matter were as those governing spirit, God could complete the likeness instantly here. A Christly nature is "a new creation," conditioned on my volition, after I have reasoned and felt the motivities for my choice surge my nature, and may be instantly bestowed as a creative act of God; but a perfect intellect, being differently conditioned, may take a vast portion of time. And as the body has become grosser by sin, nothing

short of resurrection power will restore it to its original harmony with mind and spirit ; but we are promised that he "will fashion our vile [coarse, humiliated] body like unto his own glorious body." The act by which we are brought into the place of sonship is the introduction into our natures of the divine life, an act of the Spirit. By virtue of what the life is, it dominates the entire man, and stops sinning. It would not be the Christly nature if it did not. The seed remaining ends the sinning. Sonship requires obedience. The highest relation that God sustains in his union with human nature is one of natures. He has taken our *nature* upon him, that he might give his *nature* to us.

He has chosen that the mightiest revelation of himself, the abiding revealment, should be through human nature. And this union must be effected through the Spirit, the divine and human must be united really before the conditions exist by which God's relation to humanity can be discerned. No fallacy is more prevalent than that man by reasoning can discern God's nature, or that mind alone is the essential means of revealment. Had God created Jesus outside human nature, we would not have had a proper object for our faith. "He took not upon him the nature of angels but the seed of Abraham," placing human nature where he originally designed it should be, in eternal union with Himself. Our



humanity is now exalted far above principalities and powers, at the right hand of God, in eternal relation to himself as nothing else can be, the pledge of a Christlikeness in the end of the redemptive scheme, for "we shall be like him." The Saviour of our ministries is too commercial, too secondary, too much a go-between for guilt and sin, to the neglect of the re-creative, transforming, divine-empowering Spirit which he also bestows.

We remove rubbish to build foundations; we enter the building when fitted for occupancy. "Ye are God's building," not only as to workmanship, but occupancy; and such beings have fellowship with Jesus, in his ever-widening knowledges as to who occupied his human nature.

"Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?" Here is a human nature hypostatistically related to the divine, proving sin had no ground in necessity, was no part of God's plan, "tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin;" "born of a woman," "of the seed of Abraham after the flesh," whose nature reveals God; "the only begotten of God," the divine assurance that the same Spirit can beget in us the same life, entitling us to the same relation, "whereby we cry Abba, Father."

Between this and the modern doctrine of the fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man, based on creation, there is an impassable gulf, without the

supernatural act of the Spirit putting us into the divine family by sonship. He assumed our nature that he might glorify it, and portray the thought of God's love to us, for he wants us to be what Jesus is. He shows us ourselves by contrast, and reveals our sin through suffering love. He not only shows us *what* we are, but *why* we are thus, and what we may be; for, beautiful as redeemed human nature may be, it is not an end in itself, it is but a dwelling, the temple of God.

The Fall came so early in the history of the race, that man had no opportunity to experience his relation to the race. Unity in love was the foundation fact to be revealed, equality was the standard, Christlikeness the form,—to God only, subjection. All assumptions of and usurpations of authority in society, church, or state, by the individual, are contrary to the constitution of the race. "One is your Master," and all ye are brethren. Before the Fall the perfect nature of man responded to every attribute in the perfect nature of God. No mediator was necessary. When man is restored to Christliness, and Christ shall have "delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father," mediation will be finished. Defective attributes demand a mediator, some one to reveal to the imperfect nature his God. Christliness is humanity filled with divinity. Perversity through sin begets false thought of God concerning man; we record our subjective states and feelings toward him, and think we

are writing true systems of theology, including predetermined damnation, limited salvation, and every other crudity that a perverted faculty might reflect in thought. The Christlife cannot be thought out, it must first be brought in, and then we live what we are. A Christlike act presupposed a Christly spirit. He always intended to fill the inner court, the holiest of all, with the Shechinah glory of his own selfhood.

We covet the liberty, the power, the grace, the wisdom, the purity and compassion, the victory over death and hell, of the Son of God. We covet them, not because they are something great in themselves, but because our great nature demands them, as essential complements of itself, for what belongs to the Divine in infiniteness belongs to the human in finiteness. "All things are yours, for ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." All our possibilities lie in faith in the Jehovah Jesus. "Ye believe in God, believe also in me." Everything that tends toward Christlikeness tends toward final unity, and the gathering "together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth."

Glorious as Christ's human nature is, he constantly refers to its inferior place, — "I in them and thou in me;" "my Father, is greater than I;" "as thou, Father, art in me."

The unchanging purpose of God being that human and divine nature should be eternally united, the re-

demption scheme can have only one purpose, to restore man to his original estate. Negatively, damnation is only a sequence of his present condition; the positive side of God's plan is toward Christliness. The past assures us he is working in that direction, while his promises assure us "we shall be like him."

Christ carried into eternity the experience of a human life lived in sinlessness. We must carry ours with their consequent losses, and while restored to his likeness in moral purity, intellectual perfection, and physical immortality, we will also bear the memories of our fall and our present relation to it. Even the blood-washed sing, "and washed us from our sins in his own blood." He will restore us to the likeness of Jesus in *moral purity*. Generation from above gives life, the relation of sonship, and the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father.

The impartation of a new life is not the sanctification of the individual. All sons seek purity. Every man that hath the Christian hope of seeing Jesus as he is "purifieth himself." Nothing in the life imparted needs purifying, but the self into which the life is generated needs purging. We are conscious this impurity is not ours by choice, we are also conscious it is not the fruit of the new life, and are just as conscious it is not self-originated.

There is an inherent defilement that makes us unlike Jesus; it produces loathing, not guilt; humiliation,

not condemnation. There is not the Christly obedience, and "the faith of the Son of God," that Paul had after his crucifixion. Like Christ, the morally pure man revolts against all sin, while he gives himself sacrificially for the sinner. To be Christlike means to serve humanity at the cost of ourselves.

All the resources for sonship and purity are now at hand. Christ has brought them to us, and presses them upon us, and he calls for spirits like himself to march with him to the conquest of the world. IF THE WORLD, OR EVEN THE PRESENT CHURCH, WAS FULL OF CHRISTLY MEN, WE COULD EASILY SOLVE EVERY PROBLEM BEFORE THE RACE.

He calls for such in pulpit, pew, store, workshop, on farm and street,—men who have dominion over nature's forces, men who can make the common acts of life a sacrament, men too true to be bribed, too manly to legislate unrighteously, who grow stronger helping the weak ; manly men, Godly men, who make the state and church serve them in serving God. Not tools, but agents ; not servants, but sons of God ; not automatic machines, but originators of better things for God and humanity.

All kingdoms must perish that hinder the production of Christly men and a Christian race. Christ has so determined, and he will bring it to pass. "The whole creature groaneth for deliverance from the unchristly." Nations seek to unload the accumulated evil

of their own doings. All mankind is in a ferment ; the leaven is permeating the three measures of meal. Politics are their own scourge. The touch of a general resurrection has been felt. Christly men are coming to preach him ; Christly men are coming to serve him ; Christly women are coming to train a nation from the cradle. Christly statesmen are coming to prove that our statute from the Infinite One can govern a world in righteousness ; namely, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Christly merchants and manufacturers are coming to hush the wheels long enough to give one day a week for a sweet psalm, and not for revelry and blasphemy, while drawling sentimentalists step aside to see a man make his own cross while he obeys God.

When these Christlike men gather to pray, heaven will be taken by violence, and the violent will take it by force. When Christlike men ask for favors, it will take a Divine Father to answer their requests. His heart is aching for men according to his plan. He can wait ages for them, but he cannot change the standard. He predestinated they should be so, and nothing else will please him. It may have once "repented God and grieved him at the heart" that he made man, but it shall not always be so. "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied." Zion shall awake and put on her strength, her beautiful garments of purity. The waiting isles shall welcome

the message of his redeeming love. Sin shall be utterly destroyed. Man, who has made this desert, will unite with God in redeeming it ; and the hitherto impossible, because of man's determinations to evil, will come to pass. The blooming roses will make fragrant the desert waste ; and man will see in Christ "all power" to transform, purify, and sanctify, save not only one or another, but the whole world. If Christ had the men, it would have been done long ago.

*We shall be like Jesus in mental perfection.*

Moral obtuseness certainly affects our mental vision. To be pure clears it to a grand degree, but we do not expect it in this world. While perfect, his mental nature was under the law of growth. "He grew in wisdom as a man." Now, the spirit is fed by *revelation*, the mind by *inspiration*, the body by *quickenings*. When we see him face to face, these will pass away. Because the mind is functionally imperfect, it must have inspiration to illumine it ; and the action of the uninspired will be unreliable, consequently error, ignorance, misconceptions, will be manifest in all we do, and are related to, not interfering with our purity or love, but always imperfectly representing the inner realities. Here is ground for boundless, Godlike compassion in us all.

Physical likeness to Christ is to be ours at the resurrection. This will complete the man, and fully redeem the divine pledge ; and when he beholds him,

methinks his heart will say, "This is what I unchangeably conceived, and though some have marred my plan, and destroyed themselves, I have my own forever." How he watches now our determinations as our natures are changed "from glory to glory"! How grieved over our delays and perversities, the endless adjustments because we will not, when he wills, the gentleness under disobedience!

Ho, ye thirsty ones! Let the Spirit that begat him, beget thee. Let the Spirit that filled him make for thee a Pentecost, and the charms of human splendors and institutions will become as toys compared to the holy nature who sees God and his purposes, and, conditioning himself to these realities, puts worldly kingdoms under his feet. Alive to all life's realities, he understands the dark things, and finds in entering their domain that the Christ has preceded him, and he sees Christliness in darkness, sorrow, and death; then human traditions will lose their lustre in the face-to-face vision.

"Such a man, soever humble though he be, is the real maker of civilizations, the divine reformer of nations, the eternal worker of righteousness. God has provided, and man has discoverèd, no greater force to work out the redemption of the race than of the wholly unselfish life that seeketh not its own. It is not with institutions and formulas, so much as with men, that God unfolds his own life in the develop-



ment of humanity. Men in whom he can have his loving and righteous way; men with a faith as insuppressible as light; men who are incarnations of his drawing, sacrificial love." Christ will raise up a brotherhood of men to save the world who not only believe in being like him, but men like him.

In the fulfilment of this purpose to make a race of Christly men, God has to contend with spiritual atheism called self-righteousness,—the deification of the creature. Pharisaism substitutes creeds for life, and grudging tenths for "a living sacrifice."

Christly men not only believe in the sufferings of Christ, but they "fill up the measure of his sufferings" by suffering with him. If we want to feel the heart of God, we must have one like it to feel his.

Christly men press their way to the goal through loss, persecution, scorn, false brethren, and spiritual foes with wounded hands and scared brow. They are "looking unto Jesus." They see the foreknown and predestinated purpose of God shaping the image to the likeness of his Son; and when the goal is reached, and we see the First-born, we shall be like Him. Like Him!

## XIII.

## DIVINE HEALING.

Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses. — *Matt.* viii. 17.

What then does it mean that Christ "bare our sicknesses"? Does it mean that he literally had our sicknesses transferred to him, and so taken off us? Does it mean that he became blind for the blind, lame for the lame, a leper for the lepers, suffering in himself all the fevers and pains he took away from others? No one ever had such a thought. How then did he bear our sicknesses, or in what sense? In the same sense that he took them on his feeling, had his heart burdened by the sense of them, bore the disgusts of their loathsome decays, felt their pains over again in the tenderness of his more than human sensibility. Thus manifestly it was he bare our sicknesses. — HORACE BUSHNELL, D.D.

THE recent interest in the subject of healing by faith independent of natural means; the many professed healers; the various homes opened to those who desire treatment; the diversity of moral character in those who produce the same results; the Scriptures used, and the estimate placed upon them; with the character of results produced,—is the cause why I insert this chapter in this volume.

Once for all, let it be understood, the writer believes in healing by divine power in answer to the prayer of faith. The stamp of the divine is on these cases; but he cannot believe that multitudes of cases

where divine healing is claimed is true from the facts in the case. That there is much fanaticism on this subject the best exponents of the doctrine themselves admit. Many remarkable cures have followed the labors of "Christian Scientists," "hypnotists," "mesmerists," "Catholic missionaries," "heathen priests," "magnetic healers," "witch doctors," "Indian chiefs," and "Mormons," and they are fully authenticated. The diversity of character, producing by different methods *the same results*, and all claiming different causes, requires us to look for a common ground. In many of these cases divine power is ignored, and a number of cases perfectly authenticated reveal unnatural conditions existing by the very same cause that others were removed. This question is all the more difficult of solution because many interested are men and women of real piety, and of faith in God.

I wish now to state some things that under any of these auspices are not being accomplished.

1. *The dead are not being raised.*
2. *No one born blind receives his sight.*
3. *No one born deaf is restored to hearing.*
4. *A lost tooth is never supplied with a natural one.*
5. *A broken bone has never been properly set without manipulation.*
6. *A case of leprosy cured.*
7. *No lost limb has ever been restored.*

I know of no authentic record of any of these things being accomplished in modern times. *Contrast the cures of Jesus.* "Go your way, and tell John the things which ye do hear and see; the *blind* receive their sight, the *lame* walk, the *lepers* are cleansed, the *deaf* hear, and the *dead* are raised up." "And there came unto him great multitudes, having with them the lame, blind, dumb, *maimed* and he healed them: insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb speaking, the maimed whole, the lame walking, the blind seeing: and they glorified the God of Israel." Notice what Jesus is mentioned as doing "beside many others," "dead raised," the "blind seeing," the "dumb speaking," the "deaf hearing," the "maimed whole" (lost limbs restored), the "lepers cleansed," an amputated ear restored.

The cases recorded of the apostles have the same divine stamp upon them. The lame man at the gate Beautiful, the cripple at Lystra, the young man who fell from the window raised from the dead, Dorcas also raised by Peter. Nothing unusual is recorded of several of the apostles after Pentecost in this regard. Nearly all the miracles of Christ and the apostles occurred in the earlier part of their ministry. Paul, the greatest teacher, only mentions healing as one of the gifts *once* in the thirteen epistles he wrote.

He called Luke "my beloved physician;" left Tro-

phimus at Miletus sick; Epaphroditus was sick nigh unto death and he did not heal him. He had a physical weakness himself he thrice prayed to have removed, but received no cure. It was his own sickness that caused him to preach the gospel on his "first visit" to Galatia. In the Epistles to the Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, 1 and 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude *no mention whatever is made of healing*, except in the list of gifts recorded in the twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians. With the fact that only three of the epistles mention it in any form, and Paul simply mentioning it as one of the gifts, in the minds of the apostles it could not have occupied as prominent a place as many give to it.

*Healing for the body is not a part of the last commission to the apostles, when Jesus sent them out to evangelize the world.* Paul, writing to the Gentile world, merely refers to it as mentioned above, and it was not in his commission received "by revelation." Matthew, Luke, and John record no such commission, nor is it found in Mark's Gospel. Every scholar knows that Mark xvi. 9-20 is considered spurious. Dr. Tischendorf, who discovered the oldest copy of the New Testament, in St. Catharine's Convent, Mount Sinai, in 1859, says that there is no reference to anything after the eighth verse. Tregelles and Griesback also admit

it is spurious. Eusebius, who lived in the early part of the fourth century, an eminent Greek scholar, says this paragraph "is wanting in almost all the existing copies." The Revised Version, the result of the best scholarship of our own times, separates it from the rest with this note: "The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end." One may brush aside such facts with the statement that they believe the Bible, without any scholarship, but they ought first to ask how the present book called the Bible had an existence. If this *is* part of the commission, it is as binding to "raise the dead" as to "heal the sick."

One must not forget that the Saviour used means such as "washing," "anointed with spittle," and the apostles anointed with oil.

In the "Magna Charta" of the gospel, the "Sermon on the Mount," no reference is made to healing.

One marked characteristic of every case of divine healing is that there are *no relapses*, or *noticeable deficiencies* in the condition of the subject, or *lingering weakness*, after the subject is healed. All mere experimenting proves assumption, and not the gift of healing. This faith is the gift of God, and he who possesses it has the persuasion of God that *he* intends healing this person. The faith don't heal, God heals, and the faith that he will do so is imparted, and consequently declared in his name. I will contrast later

the faith that saves the soul, and which exists in connection with divine healing. There is no scriptural proof that the gift of healing continued with any one person.

Many advocate that the individual to be healed must be entirely yielded up to God, as an essential qualification for healing. Jesus made no such requirement, nor the disciples; on the contrary, he mentioned the fact that healing had little moral effect, when he said, "Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine? Were there none found that returned to give glory to God save this stranger?" Mark says, "he could do there no mighty work, *save* that he laid his hands upon a few sick folks, and healed them," at one place; the healing sick folks not being considered "mighty work."

One of the difficulties concerning the claims of those who assert they possess the gift of healing, is that others, who reject Jesus and the Holy Spirit, and even atheists, produce equally as marvellous cures. Relics of saints to which thousands have made a pilgrimage at great hardship, have seemingly possessed great curative properties; thousands of cases, being well authenticated, have been healed. Dr. Mesmer wrought as wonderful cures as are being wrought in many cases of modern faith healing. Christian science is not behind in the cases of healing. African witch-doctors have wrought marvellous cures, while the priests of

divination of Asia are not a whit behind any of them. Tens of thousands have been cured of scrofula by the touch of one king. All these, and many more *classes* of healers might be mentioned, — Christians and pagans, Romanists and Protestants, spiritualists and atheists, who are worthy competitors for fame, and can each prove equally marvellous cures, though ascribing them to radically different causes, *all reaching the same limit, and stopping short of what Christ or his apostles accomplished.* Some of the teachers of divine healing, acknowledging these facts, ascribe the power to accomplish these cures to Satan ; if this be true, which we do not admit, then Satan can accomplish as great cures *without* divine power, as many modern “faith healers” can with it, which is absurd. Moses made no headway with Pharaoh until he did something the magicians could not do. Many so-called remarkable cures, so seemingly remarkable to the uninitiated, would not be worth anything to prove a divine power with the masses of heathen, whose own priests can effect *without faith in Christ equally as remarkable cures.* There is no healing of a Scriptural type in which God does not figure ; and if another, without divine aid, can produce the same results, it is far more reasonable to suppose that *both* are operating under some subtle law of mind over matter, without understanding the cause, and yet producing the same end. We must ever remember that when we set a law in motion it will produce the same



results as if another had set it in motion, and uniformity of result must have had the same cause. If I remove a fever by mind treatment, and another removes it by incantation, while another removes it by a touch, and still another by prayer, one thing is certain, the result is the same, the fever is removed ; but suppose none of these means have been used, but a case like this, duly accredited :—

“A hotel-keeper in New Hampshire, lingering at the point of death, as was supposed, for weeks with typhus, saw the flames burst from his barn. ‘Great God!’ cried he, ‘there is nobody to let the cattle out!’ He sprang from the bed, cared for the cattle, broke out in a profuse perspiration, and recovered. The burning barn gave him no strength, but the excitement developed latent energy and will” (*Faith Healing*, by Dr. Buckley, p. 50). Now, had some one professing to have healing power aroused the same mental action, the fever would have as quickly given way, and moisture would have come to the surface, and health been restored. One declares it is the influence of mind over disease. Another declares the disease is only in the mind ; another claims spirits have driven away the disease ; another, the power of the will concentrated on the difficulty ; while another declares it is a divine act. *In every case the result is the same.* An eminent Christian physician told me he was called to a case of obstetrics, where the woman was in severe

pain, at the proper time, with due enlargement, and supposed delivery had come, to find no offspring existed; and when her mind was assured of the fact, every sign of it disappeared. Was that a divine act, — the delusion, or its removal?

To call a case *divine healing* that a sceptic can produce by mental manipulations, is practically to deny its divine origin. If a wicked man can produce the same results in healing as a good man, the cause of the healing must be other than faith in God to heal.

Nor is there any proof of divine interposition in a case where nature unassisted has produced the same results. I do not here say that God does not assist nature in a gradual way to recover one from a lingering illness, but the testimony of such an one must be subject to the severest of tests; for one may be mistaken as to what was divine and direct and what was natural, *and in both cases the sensations are the same* whether directly healed by divine power or natural causes. A lingering illness overcome in time without medical aid is not an evidence of divine healing, but rather that many could recover without the aid of medicines, which is no doubt true. It is one thing to have a fever broken by a mental strain of great expectation and a siege of prayer, leaving the person weak and helpless, and another to read, "And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother lying sick of a fever, and he *touched* her hand,

and the fever left her, *and she arose and ministered unto him.*" Christ and his apostles proved their claims by their works.

Another difficulty in solving this question is that in some cases the disease had no existence outside the mind of the patient. Authentic cases exist where people have died of what was called consumption, when a *post-mortem* proved their lungs were sound. I witnessed an operation by a noted surgeon for a tumor, nine other surgeons agreeing on the case, to hear him say, after making the incision, "Gentlemen, there is no tumor here," a look of disappointment resting on every face.

Both diseases and cures have been produced by mental influences. Under the different names of "necromancy," "witchcraft," "divination," "mesmerism," "magnetism," "spiritualism," "hypnotism," "Christian science," "mind cure," and "faith cure," *the same things have transpired, the same diseases been cured.* Sir Humphry Davy cured a case of paralysis by placing a thermometer under the tongue of the patient to secure the temperature. He at once claimed to experience relief; this treatment was continued for a short time, and the patient recovered. He supposed the inserting the thermometer under his tongue was treating the disease, and was cured. I wish it to be borne in mind that by prayer and faith cures are effected, but nothing more remarkable than many

others clearly proven without it; *and merely the cure itself* is no proof of a special divine act.

No harm can come to the truth concerning divine healing, to admit what is true,—*that in proportion to the number treated of the same mental type*, there are as many shortly die after treatment by professed healers as by physicians, while many who do not die relapse, and the disease manifests itself. *No case of divine healing relapses, and no case of divine healing fails.* One of the modern fallacies connected with teaching on this subject is that of insisting that, whatever the symptoms, one must “go forth counting it done, acknowledging and praising him for it. Do not look for the immediate removal of the symptoms,” etc. I know a lady friend, an educator, writer, and beautiful Christian, who for quite a number of years has had increased loss of hearing. Meeting her one day after an interval of years, I asked about her hearing, as I knew her deafness had been growing. She said she was looking to the Lord for healing. I said, “God bless you!” and went on to my meal awaiting me. The next morning as I passed to breakfast, she came out of her tent and said, “I have had a dreadful night of it. I have been claiming my hearing, and I told you I was looking to the Lord for it. I ought to have said I am healed; I am inwardly, but it has not manifested itself outwardly.” The one thing I noticed was how much her deafness had increased since I last met

her. She is still deaf, and yet claiming healing, only it is not yet manifest. How does this accord with divine healing? Such a testimony from such a source cannot but militate against that person's testimony in other things. Was the so-called "inward healing" a consciousness, or a delusion? If a consciousness, what faculty expressed the reality? *Perhaps some one can tell who teaches this theory.*

Many teachers of this class hold that healing for the body is conditioned, like salvation for the soul, upon the exercise of faith by the individual, and that whoever will may believe for healing. Some say it is an act of distrust to resort to remedies, and that the atonement is for sin and sickness alike, and both by faith in Jesus. Evidently the *faith* exercised here is *confounded*. The faith that saves from sin is not a free gift from God. The most of the advocates of spurious healing teach that faith for salvation is a gift. If so, there can be no salvation until it is bestowed; and not to bestow the gift is to be responsible for the soul being lost. The absence of faith is blameworthy, so Christ taught; why be blamed for the absence of a bestowment? *Whoever has faith is saved.* Every individual knows the sin the Holy Spirit convicts of, is, not believing on Jesus Christ. If faith is a bestowment, we cannot believe until it is imparted. After it is imparted *we cannot but believe*, leaving no room for virtue in the act of believing. This theory

is false, and it removes the responsibility for the sin of unbelief outside of the unbeliever. On the other hand, the "gift of healing" is a direct bestowment, *faith* being conditioned *not upon a general promise applicable alike to all men*, but upon a divinely imparted assurance that the subject is favorably considered of God himself for his healing power. Those who "sin unto death" are not to be prayed for. Who but God can determine who commits that sin? What promise covers those who do not sin unto death, so that any believer can go to the bedside of the sick, and be assured he is pleading one of God's own promises? This whole matter is guarded by the statement, "The prayer of *faith* shall save the sick:" not simply anointing or prayer, laying on of hands or unity of desire, or all combined; not "any believer can exercise faith to save the sick." This accounts for many of the failures, as well as the many glorious divine healings.

If it is in the will of God to save the sick one, HE imparts the faith as a gift, and he who possesses it merely communicates it in the spirit of the faith, while God does the healing in a divine way, sometimes using means, at other times not. A fig was suggested as means for Hezekiah; spittle mixed with clay for the blind man, etc.

Contrast this with the idea that if one would only exercise faith for another, they would be healed. How many struggle to believe for the healing of loved

ones who die after a long conflict, and yet they persist against evidence that recovery will come. When at last they are defeated they doubt God answering prayer at all, and cry, "What is the Almighty that we should serve him? and what profit should we have if we pray unto him?" A careful inquiry into these cases shows they clung to some general promise of universal application, *and took their earnest hope for the assurance of faith.* Had they received assurance from God, he could not contradict himself, and the one believed for would have been healed; for healing, *per se*, does not necessarily come under the law of freedom, and can be accomplished independent of the will of the subject, as several Scriptural cases confirm? *Not so* in a case of salvation from sin: the faith of the individual is absolutely necessary, and any divine act concerning the sinner is conditioned upon his determinations, which are wholly uncaused outside himself; and yet when he believes unto salvation, there is no promise exclusive for him to claim that every other sinner outside of hell might not use for the same purpose, and with the same result. The faith for salvation *is not* a gift, but the salvation is. The faith for healing *is* a gift to assure the healing of the one believed for, *and in no instance where it exists has any failure been known.* Remember, I am not holding that prayer does not sometimes precede the assurance of faith for the healing, and

if the subject is not healed, is not helpful to the patient. *I am pleading for divine healing, divinely attested, and I insist that where the divine gift of healing exists, it is not a state of faith from which acts of healing spring, but a direct, immediate, divine persuasion that this subject is to be healed by divine power; and where it exists it never fails.* Nor do those who possess it struggle up through long prayers to a belief that they can claim this gift. It is as positive an assurance as the witness to our salvation is, as far as a divine persuasion of the reality goes, with this difference, faith for salvation, with its witness, is subjective, and wrought into personal experience, while in faith for healing our assurance is for an object outside of us, and the only experience we retain is the consciousness of the divinely wrought assurance.

In many cases of divine healing the individual has believed for himself. In these cases the assurance of faith is imparted to the individual direct, and may exist before God does the healing, or may include remedies or acts divinely suggested that aid to recovery. Jesus now can send the individual to perform a service to aid in his own recovery, or bless means to that end. *I have no recollection of any case seeking healing of Jesus refusing to act as he directed regarding the healing, and so "all" were healed.*

It is not so concerning salvation from sin. Many came to him to be saved who, using their freedom,



rejected the means, and were lost. *He could impart faith for healing*, but *not* for salvation from sin.

I now want to speak of the doctrine that "*healing is in the atonement.*" This is one of the cardinal points of many of the modern teachers of healing by faith. Thousands have caught up the phrase, and it runs unchallenged by many, who use the term because their teachers did. The leading text used is, "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases." I wish to disabuse the average mind of the idea that Jesus ever carried in his own person our infirmities and diseases; that is, *that they ever became a part of, or entered into, or was put on, him*, but that he "*took*" them upon himself to redeem us from them, and that they have *a place* in the process of redemption, but do not belong to the atonement (or at-one-ment).

This *new* theory would have no existence if the *sin* question was rightly adjusted. It is the offspring of a Calvinian idea of sin, confounding the effects of sin and sin itself. The atonement deals only with that which hinders "oneness with him." Infirmities and diseases do not belong to this class, and to place healing of our diseases in the atonement is to do violence to the Old Testament figures. "Healing diseases," "casting out devils," and "raising the dead," are not mentioned as results of the atonement. When Peter healed the lame man at the "Beautiful Gate" of the temple, *the resurrection life was emphasized as*

*the power that made him whole.* This Jesus emphasized when he raised Lazarus. "I am the resurrection and the life," said he, and no reference made to an atonement. This is a work of the Spirit, through the *name* of Jesus. *What atonement is necessary to heal a disease?* Let some who advocate this theory answer. Jesus healed a great multitude who never received the atonement; so did the disciples. Millions who have received the atonement, and have been made at one with God, have been diseased from birth. The misconception of the faith for healing has necessitated this other idea. Jesus said of the man blind from his birth, "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents: but that the *works of God* should be manifest in him." Not the atonement; and the blind man did not mention anything concerning the atonement. The act of healing was intended to call his attention to the One who heals spiritual malady. Faith in the atonement secures the removal of sin, and its consequent spiritual death; no subsequent resurrection is needed to make the salvation complete. No amount of belief that healing is in the atonement will hinder our dying physically; and our real physical life is the result of the resurrection power, and not the atonement. *All* quickening of our mortal bodies now is not because Jesus had made an atonement for sin, but as a pledge of resurrection at the end of the age. We are not quickened because Jesus died. The Spirit that raised

up Jesus from the dead quickens our mortal bodies. Atonement for sin — quickening for our bodies.

*To sum up : —*

1. No instance of raising the dead, opening the eyes of one born blind, or the ears of one born deaf, or setting unaided a broken limb, or restoring a lost one, or curing a case of well-developed leprosy, is on record to-day, duly authenticated, as the work of those who claim power to heal. Jesus is the same, and is able to accomplish the same cures ; but evidently the “greater things than these shall ye do,” were not greater acts of healing or miracle-working power.

2. There are cases of divine healing of diseases in answer to prayer, the assurance imparted by God that the subject will be healed, and such cases never fail, and have no immediate relapses. In some of these cases *means* are used ; in some they are not. God sanctions both.

3. Many cures are effected, and are as well authenticated, by other agencies, without medicine and without invoking divine aid, as remarkable in their results, and as permanent, as those by so called “faith healers.”

4. A careful investigation of the professed cures shows as great a proportion of deaths and relapses as an equal amount of cases treated by medical skill, while surgery has saved many a life that otherwise would have been lost.

5. Those who prove their having the divine gift of healing; frequently do not possess the gift, either for others or themselves.

6. Only three of the Epistles refer to the matter, and healing is not in the world-wide commission given to the disciples, or in Paul's commission given by direct revelation.

7. No mention is made of healing in the Sermon on the Mount.

8. There are no relapses, deficiencies, or lingering weaknesses after a subject has been divinely healed.

9. Faith for healing is a divine gift, never bestowed unless the subject is to be healed of God.

10. Faith for healing and faith for salvation are not the same; to make them so, is to submit Christianity to a test it cannot stand.

11. All cures not divinely wrought have a certain limit beyond which they cannot go, many of which are purely imaginary, and need the bolstering of such teaching as, "It will return to you if you don't keep believing."

12. Divine healing is an accomplishment manifest to the one healed, and not a matter with adverse manifestations. The blind man said, "Whether he [Christ] be a sinner or no, I know not: one thing *I know*, that, whereas I was blind, now I see." Not I am believing I see, but "*I see*."

13. There is no record of any person refusing to

meet the terms of healing as prescribed by Christ ; millions reject the terms of salvation.

14. Persons have been cured of real maladies who supposed they were being treated medically, when they were not receiving any treatment at all for the disease.

15. No harm can come from a true statement of the deaths and relapses of those who profess healing, and a just comparison of facts in the medical world. Truth can only be advanced by such a process, and to object to it savors of deception.

16. To believe, for healing, a promise of universal application concerning salvation, is to engender unbelief, and has frequently led to scepticism, when the results contradicted the belief.

17. That healing is in the atonement, and is of universal application, can only lead to the wildest fanaticism in dealing with diseases, and cause a great amount of unnecessary death.

18. Many who claim the gift of healing, when the worst comes with themselves and others, seek the aid of physicians.

19. Christ told his subjects not to publish his cures.

20. No one is responsible for not possessing the gift of healing ; all are responsible for not being saved.

21. I am pleading for healing divinely wrought, whether gradual, instantaneous, without or with means.

22. I am pleading for divine healing, divinely attested, and I insist that where the divine gift of healing exists, it is not a state of faith from which acts of healing spring, but a direct, immediate, divine persuasion that the subject is to be healed by divine power; and where it exists it never fails.

Heal us, O Lord, by thy power! Thou hast the power. Our sins may cause our diseases; heal us of the greater malady, that the way for thy power may be open to us. Thou hast a plan; show it unto us. May we know thy truth, and may it make us free. Hinder us from leading away from the truth in our endeavor to represent it. Keep us forever from saying we know, wherein we are ignorant. May no ambition "to be seen of men" cause us to crave unrevealed things. Hold thou us to a plain path, and may we all have courage to go where thou hast opened the way for us, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

## XIV.

## CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

We count those things perfect that answer the end whereto they were instituted. — DR. ADAM CLARKE.

Be ye therefore perfect. — JESUS CHRIST.

FOR nearly two hundred years intense discussion has existed in the church concerning Christian perfection. It has been represented and misrepresented. Erroneous views have been taught concerning it by both friend and foe; yet thousands have sought and obtained an experience called perfection, and are living in a blessed spiritual state, and the doctrine and experience is spreading throughout the entire church of God.

Jesus commanded us to be perfect as our Father which is in heaven is perfect. This clearly implies that some degree of perfection is not only to be aimed at, but reached, and that it is to be a character of perfection like what our Father in heaven possesses. Certainly not in degree, but why not in kind, if we are to possess the same nature?

*Perfection in God is the absolute rectitude of his nature; and to command us to be perfect is but to express*

*the ground of spiritual unity between him and all other spirit-natures.* Though a command, it is not so much an expression of authority, setting up a standard, as a statement of unchanging and unchangeable principle. His nature demands perfection in everything. Imperfection in the sense of incompleteness does not disturb his perfect nature, but is not agreeable to it, when caused by the attitude of the creature itself. He desires the perfection of all beings capable of reciprocating his love. It is rational to believe that beings originally made in his own image, for the supreme end of fellowship and companionship, having broken the harmony of their first estate, should, if called at all, be called to occupy their former relation ; and if love sought an outlet for its bestowments upon such creatures, and the measure of the bestowments are conditioned upon the capacity of the creature's nature to receive and respond to it, that the perfection of the creature should be essential to the largest bestowments. To understand a perfect Lover we need perfect love ; not perfection in quantity, else growth would be excluded, but perfection in kind, to the utter exclusion of anything contrary to it. *Everything contrary to love is contrary to God.* As long as anything exists in us contrary to love, we will discover moral antagonism to God. As we *grow* endlessly in the life to come, any stage of growth could not be the ground of harmony between us and God ; but a



state where no antagonisms of nature exist may be. If the heart is not perfect in love, the only other possibility is "*enmity*." He being absolute and we finite, there could be no common centre of unity except in spirit.

We are not obligated to comprehend the Infinite to feel our unity, nor does any increase of knowledge reveal any reason for our unity being broken while love remains; but, on the contrary, an increase of knowledge of him intensifies our relation and fellowship. Love is known by its taste, and not by analysis: we can taste its quality, and be conscious we are free from its opposite; we can be free from doing anything contrary to its spirit, and possess nothing but a spirit of love toward all men. If we have become "partakers of the divine nature," we have the same quality of *moral* rectitude.

A perfect spirit, perfect in love, has a standard of quality capable of fellowshiping any other perfect spirit. That which is imperfect cannot embrace the perfect. We have no possible perfection here or hereafter attainable to us concerning any other attribute of God but love. Our limited *degree* of love, like a limited knowledge, does not bar our unity. A larger bestowment of love can only increase its intensity—a larger knowledge increases the possibility of our natures to be and do. Indeed, I seriously doubt whether love and essential knowledge are not inseparable.

arable. Any increase of light without an increase of love to conform to it, is but to produce conviction without ability to conform to it. Intelligence without devotion, light without love, revelation without inspiration to conform to it, and a glad recognition of divine authority with a hearty acquiescence to his commands, only leaves us in fear; for he says, "If any man love me he will keep my words;" but "perfect love casteth out fear." Not age nor growth, intelligence nor development, makes heaven a place of security, but the purity and oneness in love of its occupants.

*When God made man he was perfect in the only sense in which he ever can be.* He never will be a finality. A right nature, rightly related, is the only permanent thing possible to him. In Eden he was perfect, though undeveloped. No goal was held out to him where fixedness as a bar to any increase was possible to him, except fixedness of nature. Revelation closes with the same idea, "Let him that is holy be holy still." A perfection of *maturity* is an impossibility in this life, which would be a higher standard than the Edenic one; and *a maturity in spirits of eternal progression is a contradiction of terms.* A perfect spirit is absolutely essential to the perfection of any other part of our human nature; but the perfection of the other parts is not essential to a perfect spirit-nature, *but to a rightly related one.* Limited possibilities are not hindrances to perfect union with God,

while disembodied spirits perfectly conform to God's nature, and have in themselves the pledge of the glorification of their being in the perfection of the whole. God's process for perfecting spirit-nature is not the same as his processes for perfecting other things. By virtue of what it is, a perfection of growth is impossible to spirit-nature, as also a perfection of maturity; but a perfection of quality and character is compatible with its nature and the revealed methods of Scripture. *Spirit may be pure, though never mature.* It may be love, and love only, though *infantile*. Sin does not destroy anything essential to true human nature: it only depraves it; and if that which depraves it is removed, and the perversities of the nature corrected, the spirit-nature will normally conform to the laws governing it, and perfectly fulfil the purpose of its Creator.

The Spirit of God is love; the spirit of a perfect man is love. This is the bond of fellowship between the two. Therefore, he who is filled with the spirit of love is a perfect man, according to the Scriptural standard of perfection; and his spirit-nature is in perfect accord with the spirit-nature of God. He does not grasp the absoluteness of the Infinite One, but they are one in spirit. Jesus prayed, "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." — *John xvii. 21.*

Our experience and the words of Scripture ought to

agree, for those words can only be made real to our consciousness by experience. In seeking Scriptural perfection conviction comes, not from lack of quantity, but lack of pureness. *Perfection of substance is sought not of degree*, — a perfection of intentions and choices, not actions or service. We seek adjustments in our spirit-life, and not correct formulas. It is not so much more love we desire, — we will always desire that, — as the removal of something contrary to love that disturbs our spirits. When sin is not manifest, and we consciously love, we are never disturbed about our relation to God. But when sin manifests itself within, revealing its character, and we discover it as *our* sin, the output of *our* nature, we desire its extirpation; and its existence causes fear, loathing, and a sense of uncleanness of spirit that makes us cry out for its removal.

Such an experience is different from a conscious absence of any spirit disturbance or impurity, and the soul under the law of love, hungering and eating, thirsting and drinking, serving and growing, under an ever-increasing progression, added light and power only revealing to us our former ignorances and inability, and marking the stages of our progress, but never revealing any lack in the purity of our spirit. The *degree* of our love is determined by our capacity; the intensity of sin by the type imparted, and our development under its control. Sin may be instantly removed, and we love God with a pure heart, fervently, which is a

perfected work, while love abounds more and more throughout eternity. *A pure spirit filled with love is perfect in the only sense it ever can be.*

This spiritual perfection gives unity with the Spirit of God, while limited and finite beings are subject to the laws governing our limitation. We may be sure we are in perfect accord with God, while his will concerning us is not clearly manifest. Job was perfect and upright, and yet he could not understand the permissive will of God in his case. His spirit said, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust him." God said, "In all this Job sinned not."

Before sin entered man, God was in him, and there was no need of a mediator, or grace, or any of the conditions of the redemptive plan. He now needs revelation, inspiration, motivities, involving faith, prayer, Jesus Christ, the Mediator between God and man, to lead him back to perfection. When adjusted again, these will have served their ends, and cease to be needed. Before the Fall, a perfect nature had in itself all the conditions of direct unity with God. His freedom was natural, and he needed no outside helps. God worked himself out through the man, and all the gracious agencies used to counteract the Fall had no ground for existence. Now he is just as free, as the result of supernatural help, which is essential to restore him to perfection. When perfectly restored, the relation will be so perfect no mediation will be required.

*When man is rightly related to God and himself by perfect love, he is rightly related to every other right self, and holds the attitude of rightness toward every other self in the universe of God.* Heaven has in it "the spirits of just men made perfect." When man's entire being is perfected, there will need no temple, no altar, no sacrifice; for the former things will have passed away, and original things be restored. The spirit-nature being impure, the intellectual powers have been perverted in their use, and made to serve useless and destructive ends. Mental illumination always accompanies spiritual processes. A soul made perfect in love will have a keener mental vision, other things being equal, than one not warmed in his affectional nature. The pure in heart see God as no process of reasoning can reveal him. The spiritual dearth, of this age, of churches who have been renowned for spirituality in the past, is largely due to the development of the intellect in the letter of the truth, without a co-etaneous love for it; depending upon a clear statement of truth unaccompanied with the spirit of it, having no spiritual results. For this there is only one remedy—the revelation that comes from the Spirit. When a man's nature is true, perfect, pure, there is a perfect correspondence between all truth and his nature. No mental disturbances are set up by increased revelations of truth, when the heart is perfect, and the mind yielded up to the Spirit of God. One perfect in heart

rejects from his mind all conscious contradictions to every known truth, without regard to whether others have the same vision or no. Reason never contradicts a pure heart, though it is not its sole guide. The Spirit of God in a perfect heart leads it into all truth, and imparts the higher reason of God's thought, for guidance to our finite thoughts. Though one's spirit may be perfect, his intellect, working under different laws, must be subjected to a process of teaching and discipline all through life. The laws of association, environment, education, unconscious influence, etc., obtain long after the spirit is perfect, and lead to a greater or less number of intellectual defects.

Nor is bodily perfection possible in this life. This is postponed in the plan of God until resurrection morn. He has promised then to change "the body of our humiliation, *that it may be* conformed to the body of glory, according to the working whereby he is able to subject all things unto himself." The closing scenes of our redemption will be the elimination from our physical nature all that sin has introduced, restoring it to its normal relation to mind and spirit; and who tell the possibilities of a glorified body?

*Because of these mental and physical disabilities*, no teacher of Christian perfection, competent to teach, teaches that perfection of conduct or action is possible in this life; but while we do not teach any possible perfection outside a perfection in love, we do teach that a

perfect heart will exalt the types, and by abstaining from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, and yielding our members "servants to righteousness unto holiness," we may develop a higher type of physical manhood and mental vigor, and impart an intenser vitality to oncoming generations. Occasionally God, by faith, performs physical cures, but does not destroy death so that one never dies; and perfection by healing is not to be expected in this life.

Imperfect apprehension and comprehension result in false reasoning, which ultimates in improper actions which have no moral character, and do not deprave the spirit, because the moral nature is not involved. If one could reason correctly on all questions he would never err; but this is not possible, unaided by the Spirit, even in questions of morals. Having impaired mental powers, error, ignorance, misjudgment, mental obtuseness, idiosyncrasies, doubts (which are not the same as unbelief),—all these must be treated from an intellectual standpoint. Error must be met with truth, ignorance with knowledge, false premises with sound ones, and mental obtuseness with clearness. Our thoughts must yield to him who said, "My thoughts are not your thoughts." Doubt must yield to clearer vision. And all this means time, knowledge, growth. It would impair a man's usefulness to teach the world is flat, but in no sense his moral character. One's spiritual vision may be perfect, while his mental blind-



ness needs an apology. Many good and perfect in heart Christians do frequently very unwise things, the folly of which a more intelligent, but less spiritual, person would not for a moment tolerate, and for want of proper discrimination, are declared unholy, because unwise. After Pentecost, Peter was the victim of a false education, and had to be convinced of the broadness of the gospel he was commissioned to preach by a vision from heaven. *He was no more spiritually perfect, after his housetop vision, but a wiser man.* On questions of eschatology pure men differ, and love each other none the less. Much that we know now will soon be useless, and can only fill a niche in memory's chamber. The larger vision, the greater knowledge dispenses with it, as the noonday dispenses with the cheerless day-dawn.

*We do teach that the Scriptures warrant a perfection in the realm of our affections and volitions.* We know what an imperfect affection is,—its insufficiency, its fitfulness, its clamorings; the struggle to maintain a predominant love to God; fitful visits of our Heavenly Guest; seasons of fervor followed by seasons of declension, repentings, relentings, renewings, followed by reverses and repinings, with a feeling we are not entitled to a love to which we have been untrue; faith mixed with fear, longingly but shamefully looking into the face of him whom we have grieved, and wondering if he loves us still; crying out for a heart,—

“Perfect, and right, and pure, and good,  
A copy, Lord, of thine.”

We have not only a feeling we *ought*, but that we *can*, *love* God perfectly; that we can be perfectly united to him, and be his, — his only, — forever, nothing lacking in confidence, nothing lacking in love, perfect spiritually.

*Love never matures; it is not a growth, nor does it grow. You* may grow, and in a comparative sense mature, and so be called a mature Christian, have a mature judgment; but love never matures, it increaseth and abounds more and more; but every increase is a gift from the divine One, and not a growth. *You* may grow *in* love; the tree may grow *in* the soil; but love is “shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.”

Perfection in love is a gift, and may now be imparted by the Giver, on the conditions upon which it is bestowed. If the heart is all love there is no sin; a heart without sin is a perfect heart. A pure heart is a gift. The only perfection in spiritual things is perfection in love, therefore Christian perfection is a divine gift, and all Christians may enjoy it; and as our volitions determine our character we may ever say, “Thy will, not mine, be done,” and placing everything into God’s hands for that will to be fulfilled, say, Even so, Amen!

## XV.

THE RELATION OF THE SENSES, APPETITES, AND  
DESIRES TO HOLINESS.

Until every man's eyes are opened to the truth ; until all know universal law and its penalties ; until nature and the supernatural, being and non-being, are grasped by the intellective forces ; until the mind arrives at the summits of philosophical research and moral wisdom, — there will be room for the play of ignorance, which may prove to be the fly in the ointment, or the spark in the magazine. Danger lurks in ignorance. — J. W. MENDENHALL, D.D.

Having therefore these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God. — *2 Cor. vii. 1.*

THE relation of the physical to the spiritual ; of matter and mind ; is one of the important questions in solving the doctrine of holiness. For want of a proper consideration of this matter, reasons are assigned by well-meaning persons why we should not profess holiness, and advocates of holiness become ascetics, both hindering the cause by their false views. Irrational and unnatural views are advocated by some teachers, especially those who teach a "*third experience*" of death to self. So pernicious has this doctrine been, that homes have been robbed of their love, and various forms of fanaticism have sprung

from it. The fallacy that because we are not to be led by our sense-nature in walking after the Spirit, we are to consider our appetites and passions a foe to spirituality, has led to this view; while every unnatural prompting of a depraved body has been termed sin by another class. Our senses are the avenues through which we come in contact with the outer world. Compared to the real world in which we live, it is an exceedingly small one. Seeing relates us to light; hearing, to the vibrations of the air; taste distinguishes flavors; smell discovers odors; touch relates us to objects we come in contact with. All are outwardly related to matter, and are but media through which mind comes in contact with the material world. After the mind receives the impression intended to be conveyed, the end of the sense-faculty is reached. Our senses were not created to serve a spiritual end, but a material one. They do not generate sin, nor remove it. Neither are the inner man and the outer world dependent upon each other for existence or action. A lost sense does not impair the mental powers, nor necessarily does a lost mental power impair the physical life. Many have lost their mental powers who remain healthy and continue long-lived. Others with nearly all the senses gone have shown very remarkable mental powers. Our senses are not self-destructive, like the appetites; they have an end to serve under the direction of wise

agency. The appetites were given to preserve mankind individually, the passions to perpetuate the race; and to pervert either, must lead to countless evils, whether done ignorantly or intentionally.

What we call "animal spirits" for want of a better name, are only the announcements of a healthy condition of our bodies, and need regulation, and not destruction. The forbidding things against which holiness makes its protest are not natural, but unnatural things; perversities of nature. The senses, passions, and appetites of our physical life are God appointed, and are to be used for the end for which he appointed them, and not to be destroyed or abused. A perversity of this idea has produced celibacy, the source of a great amount of uncleanness and asceticism, with bodily lacerations, frequently costing the life of the misguided one. Many less noticeable grades of harm have come from this false idea. Luxuriousness, intemperance, sensuality, incontinency, and fornication have been replaced by penuriousness, censoriousness, self-mortification, and boasted unnaturalness, while holiness requires self-denial, self-control, sobriety, chastity, cleanness, purity. Luxuriousness is an extravagant use of pleasurable things, not forbidden if not misused, and may relate to dress, equipage, or diet. Parsimony, excessive fasting, unbecoming attire, with uninviting equipage, have hindered holiness not infrequently. While luxury is to

be condemned, stinginess is no more to be recommended, and uninviting equipage, with unbecoming attire, can never be conducive to holiness. Distinctive plainness of dress is no index of heavenly mindedness, but more frequently of censoriousness and misjudging, while uninviting equipage may make you believe you are not worldly minded, but proves contempt for all the finer sensibilities with which God has endowed us, and an abandonment of self-respect. To such souls taste, beauty, and the fitness of things have become subjects for ridicule, and the spirit of a good meeting has often been destroyed by their animadversions. Eternity alone will tell how much the finer sensibilities, to be sanctified by grace and to be utilized by the Holy Spirit, have been ruthlessly diverted by false teachers seeking to counteract existing evils. Intemperance comes under the same head, and may relate to the appetites and passions of body or mind. To not eat a sufficient quantity of food, through a misguided idea, is as much an act of intemperance as gluttony, and as contrary to the spirit of holiness. I have known holiness camp-meetings to be very much hindered by the mercenary spirit that provided an insufficient quantity and quality of healthy food, cleanly served, for those who attended; while "*conscientious scruples*" would not admit a peanut stand, or melon-cart. In caring properly for one's self we are preparing a better instru-

ment to serve others. Some advocate that a desire for comforts and conveniences is contrary to the spirit of holiness, and cite the unavoidable experiences of saints in all ages. Paul objected to the unlawful beating, and prevented it; called for his cloak at Troas, and teaches, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we reap your carnal things?" That one may refuse such desires to serve better ends is clearly taught in the requirement to keep our body *under*; but a desire for pleasant things is proper, and does not become harmful until it influences the will to do something contrary to our sense of right, as far as our spiritual life is concerned. Luxury in style, food, and dress, beyond all doubt is contrary to holiness, and enervates our spirit-life, not being conducive to health of body, mind, or spirit,—a natural hotbed of uncleannesses; but healthy food, not merely to gratify tastes, becoming apparel, and helpful surrounding, *are* conducive to holiness, though holiness may, and frequently does, exist without them.

Sensuality is utterly incompatible with a holy heart and life. "The body is not for fornication, but for the Lord." The mind that regards the body as an instrument of sensuous delights merely has forgotten Paul said, "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?" and exist not for the play of their own senses, but as "instruments of righteousness

unto holiness." Many professing to be holy seem to be ignorant of the divine use of the body, and their misuse of it leads others to doubt the reality of their experience. Because of this, many don't believe holiness is obtainable in this life. Abnormal uses of our bodies must lead to suffering, disease, and death. Much of the life that now is, is the accidental fruit of misguided appetites and passions, having no end to serve, and mental protest exists against its conception through misuse. The tale of inherited prenatal dispositions toward evil, through ignorance, will never be told. Even holy parents, through ignorance of physical laws and mental influences, may propagate evil by uncontrolled passions, who would shrink from such acts if they understood the consequences, as they would from a viper in their path. In all these things Scripture is silent concerning detail, but covers them by a broad principle. "*Whatsoever* ye do, do it all to the glory of God." Appetite, desire, passion, as expressions of material laws under physical life, are not in themselves sin or sinful. Physical ills and perversities may give them undue excitement, they thus become temptations, and not then, until the mind becomes conscious of their action. A clock may run, and strike, as loud as ever, but preoccupation may leave the mind unconscious of the striking, though the sense of hearing faithfully performed its duty. Mental abstraction may cause one to pass amorous lovers without being con-



scious of their presence, in that case not even temptation exists. The physical man acts when the mind is inoperative, and under its own laws effects that which, if the mind consented to it, would leave a spiritual taint. Conditions may exist where physical disturbances produce their own results, over which the mind has no power, properly called involuntary action. These are *flesh* manifestations in distinction from *mind* manifestations, which, because they exist, some teach exclude holiness. That God can graciously interfere and remove such actions of a depraved body is true; that he does not frequently is also true. He has planned that in the resurrection he shall bestow a spiritual body, having no possible defects, and that even now an intense spiritual life quickens our mortal bodies up to right activities, destructive of many wrong ones. Stimulating food, unfavorable environment, improper objects, may awaken in our involuntary physical natures certain desires; should these desires depend for their origin upon the choice of the individual, his choice would determine his temptations. (Of course choice may arouse these desires.) James says, "Each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed." If yielded to, then comes *sin*. To determine temptation from without, which is compatible with the greatest degree of holiness, and the promptings of sin within us, one must distinguish between a desire awakened by the senses, appetites, and passions,

while the inner man recoils from sympathy with such desires, and an inner affinity for evil things, from whatever source they may arise.

The Saviour has placed lustful desires in the catalogue of adultery in the heart. Of course he means a forbidden desire entertained in the affections. To properly regard the object for which marriage was instituted cannot be lust, for God in the beginning made us so ; but a desire to misuse the relation, though sustaining the relation of marriage, is born of lust, and it brings forth sin. Thousands of professing Christians are misusing the married relation to serve unholy ends, and defile the relation. A pure bride and bridegroom are God's chosen type of the relation of a pure heart to God. All self-centred gratifications are contrary to the nature of love ; all self-centred use of God must be so too. Any act that produces a sense of defilement in the heart of the perpetrator must be an unclean act. There is a crying demand for cleansing from "all filthiness of the flesh," and that "fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints, neither jesting, filthiness, nor foolish talking, which are not convenient." There needs to be an end of so much secret confidence concerning the secret life of the married relation ; and surely the ranks of the holy will be advanced when some of its professors cease teaching younger ones how to successfully feed the passions,

while they hate the ends for which God gave them. Be clean ! Be clean !! Be clean !!! in every secret sense from all filthiness of the flesh, ought to ring out everywhere, until every act seen of God can meet the divine approval.

To profess to be holy, and do what we would wish he did not know, is to lie to the Holy Ghost. Nor can any intelligent soul deceive itself into the belief that what we ourselves feel we ought not to do, God is indifferent to, or sanctions. Our conviction that we *ought not* to commit certain acts came from him. Holiness demands that we should be true to the laws of our physical life as we understand them, as well as spiritual laws ; and much sickness, disease, and death would be averted by a faithful regard for every revelation of truth here as elsewhere.

I have been dealing more especially with the *physical side*, and will now refer to the *mental and moral*. These are manifest in appetency for possessions, friendships, knowledge, and power. How far can a holy man go in seeking the material possessions of this life? Frugality, economy, thrift, and diligence in business are required by the Scriptures. Holiness condemns prodigality, improvidence, laziness. To one possessed with the gift of *rightly* acquiring possessions, God demands a right use of the gift. Wesley's motto was, "Get all you can, save all you can, give all you can." Love, the law holy people are governed

by, has no rule of giving, is not unjust to others in getting, and has long since learned that "there is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty." If one only remembers we are God's stewards, and that the earth is his, that we can never own it, and that the only thing we take out of it as we leave it, is the character we made passing through it, we would not seek possessions for their own sake, but to be more useful to others, and increase our facilities for doing good. *A holy man cannot fellowship unholy men;* the friendships of a holy man must be pure. "In the world, but not of it," is his motto. Jesus said the world would hate you: "Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." "Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." Unholy alliances in business, civic orders, and marriage relations have cost the holiness cause thousands of its friends. Entanglements of the most complex form, have grown out of a disregard for the spirit of holiness in these things, and many professors of holiness are powerless because of these yokes not yet thoroughly broken. *Cravings for knowledge for self-gratulation are death to the spirit of holiness.* Many have diminished their stock of love by intense devotion to knowledge for its own sake. He who seeks to know, that he may better serve and sacrifice, can never acquire too much knowledge; but when sought for the vanity of the

possession, it is death to the spirit of holiness. Perhaps nothing has been more harmful to the spirituality of the church of to-day than a thirst for knowledge for selfish ends. He who seeks knowledge for the gratification of its possession, commits a crime against humanity. Holiness is a great incentive to the acquisition of all knowledges that have for their end the betterment of the race. To think of our ignorance without regret, is to lack humility; to boast of it is vanity. *Cravings for power to accomplish great good* are born of a pure, unselfish heart, and are according to the spirit of holiness. Power with God and men, was the result of Jacob's victory at Peniel. A holy heart is power over all evil, and the influence of such a life is an untold power for good. Simon Magus sought power to accomplish what the holy apostles were doing, from a sinister motive, and was not only refused, but exposed. If the thousands who agonize now for power had the motive exposed, many who fruitlessly seek, would cease their seeking, because of the revelation of the motive or desire that prompts them. Holiness demands pure affections, pure thoughts, pure actions.

Involuntary physical action does not affect our spiritual state. Consent to the misuse of our physical powers demonstrates the existence of wrong motives which are contrary to holiness. Mental appetencies, in themselves however good, that end in self, are con-

trary to the spirit of Scriptural holiness. Appetites and passions that have been implanted by God are not to be crucified, but controlled; perversities are to be destroyed. A man may be overcome by filthiness of the spirit long after the filthiness of the flesh has been removed. We count that desire depraved that seeks a forbidden object. There could be no sinful desires if there were no innocent ones. If, as Professor Bowne says, "the highest act of the free soul is the acceptance of our true nature, or the choice of right reason to be the law of our entire being," then any light that reason or revelation may throw upon any act or use of our powers that is corrective, will be conformed to by a holy heart. Our bodies, being God's temple, should be holy. Novalis said, "There is but one temple in the world, and that is the body of man." "*Keep thyself pure.*"

## XVI.

## DIVINE USE FOR SUFFERING.

The shadow of the cross under which Jesus wrought his love into the hearts of men, hangs heavy upon the closing years of our century, and no man can do the work which God wants done without walking a path that leads straight to Calvary. — G. D. HERRON, D.D.

The whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now. — PAUL.

THIS is a world of suffering, physical, mental, moral, spiritual, self-caused, inherited, and sacrificial. From the cradle to the grave millions are made to groan. Oppression, persecution, revenge, and injustice of every kind exist on every hand. The milder, but none the less acute, forms of ostracism for truth's sake, the betrayal of your confidence by professed friends, and, saddest of all, the abuse of your love, and misinterpretation of its gifts, go deepest into the nature of a true man. When Paul said, "The whole creation travaileth in pain until now," he did not mean its end had come; but we may well add, "until now," though we may not thoroughly understand the cause of it. Suffering in some form has existed throughout all creation related to man. The higher orders of things have subsisted by destroying the lower. No doubt

were we familiar with the facts, or could reduce ourselves to those limited orders of life, we would find a wise adjustment of things. Thinking our thoughts and feelings into the existences below us has caused a great amount of foolish speech. That some things should exist for others is in harmony with the highest wisdom. With a wise Creator anything that serves the end of its creation can lose nothing by suffering in fulfilling that end. Physical creation plainly declares there may have been suffering before man came. We have no evidence that man was a sufferer until sin came; since then an endless list of suffering has followed in his path, and our belief in a divine government and a righteous Father has been intensified by an over-ruling Providence revealing the ends accomplished through suffering, while the majesty of law remains intact. One cannot believe that suffering has no end to serve; surely we do not suffer for the sake of suffering! God certainly intends through it to teach us something we otherwise could not learn, making the lesson more compensative than the cost to secure the knowledge. "The Captain of our salvation was perfected *through* sufferings;" and while suffering merely cannot accomplish the production of character, suffering in penalty or sacrifice is inevitable to every bad or good character in this world. Much of the suffering in the world is the direct, or more remote, result of violating known law. It cannot be



otherwise if law is to any purpose. The law is declared to prevent, and not inflict, suffering; and if obedience and disobedience produced the same results, of what worth would a law be? and where would our estimate of right and its blessedness, and wrong and its penalty, be formed? A world without suffering could never be a world of discipline. A sense of wrong without any suffering for wrong-doing would not be a sufficient motive to arouse dormant souls to the real consequences of wrong-doing. The whole creation "groaneth" because the constitution of the race protests against wrong-doing. Pain and misery accompany wrong-doing, and express themselves on the very appearance of the wrong-doer; not that any present suffering is the full consequence of wrong-doing, but the consciousness of having done wrong shades all environment with its spirit. Contrast the bound prisoners singing "praises unto God," while the free jailer is smitten with guilt, both in jail; but what they are, determines their environment.

The element of suffering enters vicariously here, where the good suffer on account of the evil-doer; such sufferings are met by a superhuman joy, and the consciousness that to only the vicious in character can suffering leave any permanent mark. Jesus, "for the joy set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame;" his sufferings were voluntary, and assumed sacrificially the expression of the sympathy he had

for evil-doers, while he hated their evil-doing. Suffering for violated law is a direct testimony to its existence, and naturally suggests a law-giver, and that his character is such that he does not sanction evil-doing without penalty, and proposes to maintain a moral government as the cost of pain to those not in harmony with it. Suffering calls our attention to the cause, and if the cause is in ourselves, calls for its removal, and shows us our blameworthiness, which is an intenser form of suffering itself. It also calls our attention to avoidable penalty. The repetition of an offence against law usually enhances the suffering, and one is led to think before violating law, of the consequences that must follow; and in this negative way goodness, as purposed by God in conformity to law, is revealed, and through it the character of God. Even suffering as penalty reveals the majesty of God's law and the purity of his nature. Involuntary suffering, neither assumed nor penal, has a distinctive mark in a subdued manner that is calculated to arouse our deepest sympathies. Many such cases will at once present themselves to your mind, such as deformed ones, maimed ones, etc. Where the cause is voluntary, or the will is unbroken, a demoniacal expression exists.

This element of suffering for wrong-doing, while not a pure motive in itself, has been a great corrective in the lives of millions, and under gracious conditions

has been made helpful in warning others. Much ultimately well-developed Christian life has been shaped and fashioned by it in its earlier stages. Where it is involuntary and unavoidable, it has been greatly utilized by saintly spirits to magnify the grace of God, and reveal his deeper love. The experiences thus gained have more than compensated for the loss of conditions excluding suffering. Some of the most eminent saints have been the greatest sufferers. Ever "Jesus learned obedience by the things which he suffered."

He who is free to cause voluntarily suffering in himself is also able to inflict suffering on others, and even the creature groans in pain because of unnecessarily inflicted suffering by the evil choice of his master. It perhaps could be proven that this creature kingdom would have remained domesticated if man's injustice and cruelty had not driven them mad. Parents transmit diseases and vices to helpless offspring that require an infinitely loving and wise Judge to adjudicate. Here is suffering innocence, whose greatest value is to apprise our parents of what misery they can entail upon their offspring, and prevent the repetition of their sins and failures. Where no evil choice exists on the part of the sufferer, much good has come out of suffering. Bunyan's greatest influence came from his imprisonment, Stephen's from being stoned to death, Paul's from being bound. Poverty leads frequently to

self-effort. Martyrdom has inspired the church to continue in the faith. The world's heroes in righteousness have developed in conflict. The element of sympathy, awaking in us the purest of feelings leading to noble sacrifice, is frequently developed in cases of suffering, especially where others impose it, revealing the measure of love we bear to one another. Jesus at once began his ministry "moved with compassion," and his first outlays were upon the suffering, whether as a consequence of self-caused influences or more remote ones. *The measure of our love is determined by the sacrifices we make to convey it.* Jesus, being what he was, could not do otherwise than enter into the sufferings and sorrows of the race he came to save, and he sought at any cost to remove the cause. He knew that much of the suffering of the race could be brought to an end *by removing the cause*, and he sought to awaken in man those choices that would end sin, by entering sympathetically into the miseries it had caused. In that sense "he bore our sins, in his own body, on the tree." He wrought miracles, not for the acts themselves, but as a basis for faith in his ability to remove sin, and prevent thereby eternal consequence. He showed by his suffering life and death, and triumphant resurrection, that all the sufferings vile humanity can heap on a loving heart can do him no harm. *It is only the sin remaining that has to it an eternal consequent.* His human nature added to itself a perfection through

suffering for others, and with others, that could not accrue to it by any other process. Another has said, "The mind of Christ is the mind that would make each life a sacrifice to the life of others, a contribution to the life of all." As we have his mind and love in us, we suffer pain with those who suffer, or as the result of inflictions upon ourselves by wrong-doers. Paul prayed for "the fellowship of his sufferings," as a desirable experience, even "conformity to his death," as a sacrifice for others. Surely God designs to make use of suffering in producing sublime Christian character, even though its introduction into the race came by opposition to righteousness.

That some suffering has no helpful effect on mankind is clearly proven by man's history, either as punitive or vicarious. The character and duration of suffering for wrong-doing are based upon its voluntariness. He who does wrong by choice has a nature that is capable of endless suffering. Not until suffering for what one does wrong, has ceased to be disciplinary, is it incurable, our sufferings arising from the sense of our nature rather than any acts. *Judgment* is determined by our every deed done in the body; *penalty*, by what we are, as our nature is the ground of our suffering. If Christ's sacrifice and sufferings for us to bring us to God, do not lead us to a proper recognition of the sanctity of the law we violate, "there remaineth no more [other] sacrifice for sins," and a

state of incorrigibility is a state of endless suffering growing out of endless unrightness.

The vital question is: Why does not God prevent suffering, especially when it does not accomplish good moral ends? His inability to do this comes from the nature his laws act upon. To make creatures capable of endless happiness through right volitions, creates the necessity for endless misery by wrong choices; this cannot be avoided. "He ordained their happiness; they themselves ordained their fall." If suffering referred to this life only, it is evidently an overwrought thing, but if it is corrective, disciplinary, and instructive, revealing the thoughts of God concerning the immutability of his law and the tenderness of his love, and is used to work out a character of endless duration, making our Gethsemane and Calvary points of spiritual transformation, or our penal sufferings a lesson in favor of virtue, as well as the glow of Stephen's face while showers of stones crushed his body to the ground. If eternal, because of bad nature never changing, it reveals the justice of God in inflicting penalty commensurate with the crime, and vindicating his law. If sacrificial, the character wrought out by sympathetically suffering for the race more than compensates for its cost, and the insight into, and fellowship with the nature of God enlarges our being.

Suffering may be punitive, when disciplinary ends have failed.

Suffering may be disciplinary, to teach us the majesty of law.

Suffering may be vicarious, in our effort to save the race.

Suffering may be eternal, when these other ends have failed.

It may lead to a better life. It may reveal the victories of grace. It may be a means of developing a noble character. It may reveal divine love. It may be only a rightful sense of penalty for unyielding badness. Earth groans under it. Hell burns with it, while heaven's hosts, having come "out of great tribulation, shout over the sufferings they endured for the Lord."

Peter said, In suffering wrongfully "for righteousness' sake, happy are ye;" "*inasmuch* as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad with exceeding joy. If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you." The more spiritual one is, the intenser the suffering. We thus become "partakers of Christ's sufferings." "Wherefore let them that suffer according to the will of God commit the keeping of their souls to him in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator."

"Only for 'a moment' here,  
Heartaches, anguish, pain, and tears,  
Have their little time.

Soon we'll reach our heavenly home,  
Where naught of sorrow ever comes  
    To mar its blissful clime.

He to our raptured souls will show  
That paths he bade us tread below  
    Led straight to his dear feet;  
That suffering here worked for us there  
A glory far beyond compare,  
    And rest so blest and sweet.

Oh, then rejoice! the godly here  
Must feel earth's bitterest darts severe,  
    For Jesus felt the same.  
There, suffering o'er, with glory crowned,  
We'll shout the victory, and sound  
    Hosannas to his name."



## XVII.

## WHAT GIFTS REMAIN SINCE PENTECOST ?

" This, after all, is reason, — to believe the Scriptures, just because the God of the Scriptures is the God of to-day, as conversable now as ever, working as mightily, redeeming as gloriously ; to believe in the supernatural too, because we believe in nature, which, without and apart from this necessary complement, were only a worthless abortion, a fraction whose integer is lost."

But desire earnestly the greater gifts. And a still more excellent way shew I unto you. — PAUL.

IN 1 Corinthians, twelfth chapter, we find a statement of the gifts bestowed by the Spirit upon the early church as follows : " The word of wisdom," " the word of knowledge," " to another faith," " to another *gifts* of healings," " to another workings of powers," " to another prophecy," " to another discernings of spirits," " to another *divers* kinds of tongues," " to another the interpretation of tongues ; but all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as he will." Now ye are all the body of Christ, and members each in his part thereof. And God hath set some in the church : first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers ; then powers, then gifts of healing, helps, wise counsels, *divers* kinds of tongues. Are all apostles ? Are all teachers ? Are

all prophets? Are all powers? Have all gifts of healings? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret? Here is an array of gifts and offices "the Spirit divideth to each one severally even as he will." Whatever they are, they are not the product of our reasoning powers, or human intelligence. They stand in distinct contrast to all that is naturally acquired or natural endowment. Distinctively they are *gifts*, not essential attachments to our personal salvation, — though "*some*" gift is imparted to such believers to serve with, — and are not bestowed on the conditions salvation is. Much of the modern false teaching on this question would disappear if this fact was remembered. *Not a gift or office is instituted to serve a private end* or subtle ambition, much less to magnify into notoriety their possessors. Unlike salvation, the bestowments are irregular, are not necessary to character-making, and are given to fill out the lack an imperfect mental and physical organism cannot furnish, and to lead the race into the kingdom of God. Unlike salvation, they pass away, having served their purpose. To a true heart the Giver and not the gift is magnified in the possession and use of it. The early church possessed those gifts, and honored these offices. This the Acts of the Apostles clearly proves, and some of the epistles. In the varied history of the church for nineteen centuries these gifts have been more or less manifest, usually accompanying every fresh outbreak of spiritual

religion. That the clearness and intensity of the gifts have largely ceased is also true ; partly because a false teaching has been almost universal in the church, namely, that these gifts were only for a short time, as credentials for the early church. But several of the gifts, if not all, are essential in the church, to successfully carry out the plan of God to save the world. Another false theory is that they were given because of the ignorance of the age in which Christianity was introduced, *forgetting that no amount of intelligence in any age has secured to the church what the absence of these gifts withholds.* It is true "ignorant men and unlearned" (Acts iv. 13) possessed these gifts to a marvellous degree, while our wise and learned men, without these gifts, are not accomplishing the same results. If they were intended simply to take the place of the wisdom of men, now we possess it, why do not we see the same results? Stranger still, some of earth's wisest men have obtained these gifts after the largest acquisition of worldly wisdom, and have obtained greater usefulness, while "unlearned and ignorant" men in the world's estimation, by the bestowment of these gifts as the Holy Spirit willeth, have accomplished in spiritual things equal results. To possess any of these gifts now is to subject one's self to the charge of "madness" or "religious zealots," even "fools."

If we could read history with the light of true inspi-

ration, we might find that Joan of Arc was as gifted of the Spirit to perform certain things in history, independent of her personal spiritual development, in the classified lines of our theories, as Deborah was in Old Testament history ; that Hermann Francke and George Müller have the gift of faith Elijah had, when the "handful of meal in the barrel, and a little oil in a cruse" ceased not, "according to the word of the Lord." We startle with dismay when we read of Ananias and Sapphira being discerned without an ecclesiastical court, and the penalty without human infliction ; and yet through all time the church has not been wanting occasional proofs of the same discernment and results.

Modern spiritualism is the hunger of the heart for superhuman manifestations, and revelations of the supernatural, manipulated by evil persons.

These gifts in a more or less degree have existed with every spiritual upheaval, and have been bestowed by the Spirit, for the good of the whole church, and through it, the world. In teaching concerning these gifts, some have been unduly magnified to the exclusion of the rest ; and nothing is more damaging to the church, as a whole, than the segregation of those who possess one gift into an exclusive class, labelled, and seeking prominence, because they possess this gift. It savors too much of the eye, because it is a good one, trying to magnify its office over the ear or the foot.

God gives "comeliness" to the least gift, because he hath "set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him." And to magnify one gift above another is to produce "schism in the body," dishonor the workings of "that one and the selfsame Spirit," who is "dividing to every man severally as he will," and universally produces some form of fanaticism. I know some will at once say, "that is what so-called holiness people do." That professors of this experience are frequently and unjustly separated is true; but holy people have not a *gift* to magnify that any other equally as holy do not possess. The one great gift all holy people enjoy — of being "baptized into one Spirit," who afterwards bestows his gifts profusely, *and each rejoices in each other's possessions* — is itself the unifier that binds them together *in one body*.

The most common of these gifts is the most useful, as we will show when we reach it, and the one upon which the Spirit places the greatest emphasis, and he most frequently bestows outside of the one gift that all may possess, and is universally bestowed to all who are "filled with the Spirit," and is worth more than all the rest; viz., Prophecy.

The first gift mentioned is "*the word of wisdom,*" *right judgment concerning spiritual things*. This gift surely remains with the post-Pentecostal church, else spiritual realities would not be experimental verities, as they are to millions of hearts to-day. Paul had

this wisdom given unto him. *2 Pet.* iii. 15. Solomon tells us, in all our getting, get wisdom. Jesus "increased in *wisdom*," as Isaiah prophesied of him, "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of *wisdom* and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. And he shall make him of quick understanding," *Isa.* xi. 2-3. "I will give you a mouth and *wisdom*, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay or resist," *Luke* xxi. 15. Paul contrasts this wisdom from the acquired wisdom of the world. "We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery," not "man's *wisdom* that your faith should not stand in the *wisdom* of men." "*We speak wisdom*," "yet not the wisdom of this world." Had the princes of this world possessed it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. If the masses of the ministry to-day, otherwise thoroughly equipped, had this wisdom, a gift of the Spirit, they would leave their speculations for inwrought verities, their guesses for revealed truths, their reasonings for spiritual revelations, "which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual." James says, "If any of you lack wisdom let him ask of God, that giveth to *all* liberally, and upbraideth not, and it *shall be given* him." This gift is "to all," and is a bestowment of the Spirit,—who can estimate the value of spiritual wisdom. Paul prayed for the church at

Colosse, that they might be filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding . increasing in the knowledge of God.” This skill to discern God and his word is a crying lack of these days.

“*The word of Knowledge*” is the next gift. If what we know cannot be otherwise than as we know it, *whom* we know cannot be otherwise than as we know *him*. Paul said, “I know *whom* I have believed.” Jesus said to his disciples, “It is given to you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,” but to the worldly-wise Pharisees, “to them it is not given.” Here is an imparted knowledge of spiritual mysteries. How many are delving and figuring to know “times and seasons,” who claim to be revealing very essential truths to the world. Of them Jesus said, “It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.” The Father hath not even told the Son those things, nor was that the purport of his mission. But they were to receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon them, and to be witnesses of Him; to tell what they *knew* personally of Jesus. We only know what has been “revealed unto us by the Spirit,” “for the things of God *knoweth no man*, but the spirit of God,” “and we have received the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things of God.” To assume that such statements

mean merely aid to study dead languages correctly, and wade through ancient volumes of lore, and not a direct impartation of spiritual knowledge, would rule out the glorious experiences in the deep things of God, of thousands of God's best saints, and bar millions of the hungry children of God from a deep knowledge of himself. No man can give a definition of God, truth, or love that can satisfy the heart of man, without a spiritual impartation of their verity. No amount of correct exegesis of God's word will make oral to mankind the Spirit-nature of God. He must reveal himself, and can only be known through a revelation of himself. I am not objecting to scholarship; in its sphere it is incalculably helpful; but without spiritual revelation we remain ignorant of God. Jesus said to the Jews, "Ye search the Scriptures because *ye think* that in *them* ye have eternal life, and these are they which bear *witness* of me; and ye will not come unto *me* that ye may have life." *The life, the Knowledge we seek, is not in the Scriptures*; simply the way to obtain it. As well to expect health, and the satisfaction of hunger, by studying carefully the hygienic properties of food without partaking of it. "This is life eternal, to *know* thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, Jesus Christ." This is impossible after the flesh. Those who had known him after the flesh, no more considered him so, after his spirit revelation. He



promised that what the disciples needed to complete the revelation after three years of acquaintance in the flesh, we all should have by the Spirit taking the things of Christ, and showing them unto us; for He would abide with us forever. One of the baneful things we meet is ministers spending their strength on right, but secondary, things, and failing to secure that knowledge of Him that empowers every one who possesses it. The confidence of a man who knows spiritual things is a mightier argument than the clearest logic without the consciousness of the facts. *Wisdom and knowledge* must not be confounded; the one relates to the possession of spiritual truths, the other to the right use of that knowledge, which itself is power. Such a combination ought to make any ordinary man an untold blessing in the world. We admonish one another, and fellowship one another, because we each draw our wisdom and knowledge from Christ "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

"*To another, faith.*" This is not to be confounded with "gifts for healings." No doubt the element of faith, as a gift, is connected with "the gifts of healings," which is specific. This is general; that is, *bestowments of faith for many purposes besides healing*. Many cases occurred in the early history of the church, and now occur, where general principles call for specific application, involving special divine interference to

accomplish wise ends. There are many ways possible ; among the rest, by special divine interposition. How shall one determine ? This is a vital question. Some have made shipwreck of faith here by taking *impressions* for the *testimony* of faith. Where the individual asks for something possible in the will of God, and because possible, and he sees no reason why it should not come to pass, and an impression is formed that it will come to pass, and action is based upon that impression, now, to be defeated, when the very attitude was tempting God, sometimes leads to doubt. In cases where deliverance from impending difficulty is sought, or the aversion of a great calamity, the desire to see good accomplished by certain means, and many other things that could be cited, these all make it possible to presume on God, and pave the way for questioning his "immutable things." The whole question of personal salvation is excluded here ; for that faith is the act of the creature, and we "receive the end of our faith, even the salvation of our souls."

A wrongly informed person might claim faith for the salvation of other souls as an act of presumption, and cease to put forth proper effort for their salvation, persisting in claiming that they will be saved. Suddenly they are cut off in their sins. The person says, "I don't care ; I had faith for their salvation, and they are saved ;" or, "If I cannot depend upon that, what can I depend upon ?" Now, a presumptive premise must

lead to a presumptive conclusion. Not so when one has received the gift of faith, which is never a reasoning process, but a peculiar divine persuasion that what you believe for will come to pass, *accompanied by evidence that God hath spoken it*. In such cases it never fails. When an act is to be performed, assurance that power to perform the act, is always imparted, and accompanies the faith. In personal salvation assurance that our faith is acceptable to God, and what we believe for is being accomplished, responds to the one faith; but where works are to be accomplished, the power itself accompanies the gift, making us instruments through which his power comes. Thousands of well-authenticated cases can witness to the bestowment of faith in one instance, and withholding it in another under the same circumstances, even for the same person. In neither case has personal choice been involved, nor responsibility. One of the fallacies of to-day is teaching that the one who has faith for his spiritual well-being, can just as truly with the same faith believe for his body. Several specific cases in Scriptures deny the theory. Instance Paul and others. Faith for the body is a gift, and cannot exist until it is bestowed. Faith for salvation is volitional and self-caused, and cannot be imparted, neither can salvation, until it exists.

*"To another, gifts of healings."* This gift is in the plural number, as to the *gifts* and the *healings*, showing

clearly that the ability to heal was not continuous, nor resident in any one person, at all times, and that when it existed it was then a specific gift, and not a state of faith awaiting opportunity for service. The apostles themselves seemed not to have the gift for themselves or others at all times, and sometimes for others when not for themselves. Having written a chapter on "Divine Healing" (p. 159), I need not extenuate my thoughts here.

"*To another, workings of powers.*" Manipulation of dynamite, or ability to handle divine power to a wise end. All spiritual persons are familiar with scenes of lost or misused power, when it was manifestly present, by some foolish manipulation of the consciously present dynamite of the gospel, which is the "power of God," human plans compelling it to work in channels of our appointment. Power was a common word with the early church. Jesus said, "There be some here that shall in no wise taste death till they see the kingdom of God come *with power*." The kingdom was already *within* them, but not with power. They had been gifted with power before, — "power to cast out devils," "power to heal," "to raise the dead." Nor was there anything like unity among those who "cast out devils;" for on one occasion the disciples found one doing the same thing in Jesus' name, and because he followed them not, they forbade him; but Jesus rebuked them. Above the power they already possessed, they

were to receive power along lines that would place their former achievements in the shade. The healing of the lame man was by the faith that is through Jesus. The apostles had "great power in witnessing to the resurrection." Stephen, full of grace and power, wrought great wonders. Paul's preaching was "in demonstration of the Spirit and power." He taught that "the kingdom of God is not in word only, but in power," — "according to the power that worketh in us." He emphasized the "power of his resurrection," power over "the prince of the power of the air." These and many other powers the Holy Spirit gives, and withdraws, as he wills. Many select the gift they desire, and are seeking "power to heal," "to cast out devils," "to work signs and wonders," "to speak in an unknown tongue," "to discern spirits," "to teach," etc., whose only gift the Spirit sees, is adaptable is to clearly witness in power to his own inward work, so much undervalued to-day. A marked characteristic of the teaching of many who emphasize other gifts is an absence of *unctuous testimony to glorious subjective workings of the power of the Holy Ghost*, the shibboleth of which is "in Him." It is a holy art to witness clearly to a spiritual reality without confusion of ideas. Power in these respects, dynamics in prayer, testimony, ministry, reproving sin, etc., would be more abundantly bestowed if he had a spirit-filled people on whom to bestow them. Gifts are not bestowed to be prated about or to make invidious com-

parisons with those who do not possess them, while ignoring those they do possess. All "workings of powers" are of the Holy Spirit.

"*To another prophecy.*" This is the gift Paul urges us to possess next to love. It may be twofold. *Foretelling future events, and ability to instruct others.* Agabus prophesied "a great dearth throughout the world," which came to pass. On another occasion he came from Judea, and prophesied that Paul would be delivered "into the hands of the Gentiles." Paul himself prophesied that the ship he was to sail in as a prisoner would be shipwrecked, and when wrecked, he prophesied that all the company would be saved, for God had spoken to him. We have remarkable instances of God speaking to people concerning future things to-day, but the chief characteristic of this New Testament gift is to instruct and witness to spiritual things. The fourteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians is taken up largely with this gift. In the first verse, after Paul has shown, in the thirteenth chapter, *the greatest gift*, he exhorts them to desire rather that they may prophesy. Contrasting tongues, he says, "He that prophesieth *speaketh unto men to edification and exhortation and comfort,*" but "he that speaketh in an unknown tongue *edifieth himself.*" He who prophesies is more valuable to the church, because he edifies, exhorts, comforts. The one "edifies himself," the other "edifieth the church." He did not limit

them to prophesying, but preferred it to tongues, as that required an interpreter. "Greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues." A tongue not speaking "by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine," is no profit. To have the gift of tongues without some revelation, knowledge, teaching, or doctrine to edify with, is not worth anything, and is a quite undesirable gift, as also disadvantageous, requiring an interpreter. A man unfamiliar with languages, filled with the spirit of prophecy, called in Revelation, "the testimony of Jesus," is far more valuable to teach spiritual things, than the greatest linguist without being himself taught of the Spirit of God. *This lesson must be learned over by the church ; and ordinary men possessing spiritual gifts, have the opportunity God designed they should have to use them.* "Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church." "Wherefore tongues are for a sign to them that believe not, but prophesying for them which believe." "Ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may *learn*, and all may be comforted." This gift surely remains where spirituality prevails in the church of to-day. "*Covet to prophesy*, and forbid not to speak with tongues." This is the most useful gift of the Spirit.

"*To another discerning of spirits.*" This gift is an exceedingly serviceable one, — ability to discriminate

between the false and the true. We are exhorted to "try the spirits." How can we do this if we cannot discern them? This is an important gift, especially in leaders. The false is frequently worldly wise. False teachers have always existed, and frequently they deceive the very elect. It is an exceedingly desirable gift to be able to detect a false spirit, coming under the name of the Spirit of God. Many a grand meeting has been spoiled by want of discernment to keep with the Spirit of God. The very matter Paul is discussing in this chapter on the gifts is this lack of discernment, causing contentions about the gifts themselves; and had they been full of the Spirit they would have discerned the Spirit in these gifts, and their relations to one another, and not say, As a hand, I have no need of the foot, etc. He also emphasizes the fact that members of the body not as prominent as the hand, or foot, or eye, are more important; the unseen is more important than the seen. How the heart works away when an eye is lost, or an arm amputated, or a foot useless; and yet its vital work is unseen.

Like love, the one abiding gift, the heart moves on through all one's life, and pumps its life-current to each extremity. What use would the hand, foot, or eye be if the heart should cease? *The thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians is the heart's gift.* I don't wonder at Paul saying, "Though I speak with '*the tongues*,'"



have "the gift of prophecy," "understand all mysteries," "have all faith," etc., and have not love, "*I am nothing.*" Love does what all the gifts cannot do. It suffereth long and is kind, envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, rejoiceth in the truth, never faileth. "Prophecies shall fail, tongues shall cease, knowledge shall vanish away." We testify now to our partial knowledge, and of course our prophecy is partial. Oh, this part of the body that needs the eye, hand, foot, etc., and can make no show without them, how grand it is, after all. Surely Paul was right when he said, Covet good eyes, hands, feet, etc., and yet I show you a more excellent thing, a great strong heart, full of blood, sending the right life through all the other parts. These gifts of the Spirit are bestowed *on whom*, and *as he* wills; but Faith, Hope, Love, are possible to us all, and abide when bestowed, for they are the essentials to a Christlike character. What a beautiful creed:—

Confidence in the Divine All-Sufficiency and Love forever, — "Faith."

Endless expectation of good things to come, — "Hope."

A state that enables us to enter in, and enjoy these possessions, — "Love."

*"Follow after Love."*

## XVIII.

## CROSSES, WITHIN — WITHOUT

Wherever the cross has been wanting, Christianity has appeared shorn of its strength, an ineffective, lifeless, cold system. Wherever this has been lifted up, even though often associated with egregious human weakness and with serious error, it has proved an all but resistless power. The most expressive symbol, the most direct medium, and the chief fountain of the saving energy of Christianity, is the cross.—YOUNG.

WHAT ARE CROSSES? A little boy asked his father what the minister meant by a cross. He sent him to the yard to find two sticks, the one longer than the other. Placing the short one across the long one, the father asked his boy what that was. He at once said, "A cross!" His father said, "The long stick is God's will, the short one our will; when we place our will across God's will we have a cross."

This is half our answer, and is true when applied to crosses *within*, but not when dealing with crosses *without*. Crosses *within* originate when we are not conformed to the will of God concerning ourselves. Crosses *without*, when the wills of those around us oppose the will of God concerning us. The crosses within may terminate any time the individual wills to conform to the will of God. Crosses without will

last while time lasts, or until society as a whole is conformed to the will of God. In that degree will the outward crosses exist, that the world around us is opposed to the will of God; and the outward opposition will intensify in proportion to our inward conformity to God's will.

One has well said, "If my will is not with God's will, my will must be wrong, for God's will is right." Wherein there is nonconformity to God's will within, there must be antagonism to it, and while these antagonisms exist there can be no progress worth mentioning. A cross is set up within when we know what is God's will concerning us, and are unwilling to have it accomplished in us, even though we dare not disobey his authority. Millions of professed Christians are doggedly doing what they know is right, because they are obligated to do so, and through fear of the consequences of doing otherwise; or are frequently not doing the will of God, because they love not his will, and fall into condemnation. The very manner and spirit with which they serve, show they have more or less conflict to consent to do right, and yet feel unwilling to do wrong.

There is nothing in the nature of things that requires that any cross within shall exist. Everything is not only prepared for a hearty conformity to God's will, but not to put ourselves in such a relation is to do violence to our best interests now and forever.

No right end can be served by any inward opposition to the will of God. His will is best for body, soul, and spirit, and to continue opposing his will is to oppose self-interest. A good deal of the outward crosses of life have come from not yielding to the will of God within. Many have a living cross in a godless companion, who, had they followed in the known will of God, would have avoided the course that led them into these associations. Now there is no remedy but a lifelong cross, no matter what crucifixion leads to present acquiescence in the will of God. In other words, to have been in the will of God *at the right time*, makes some things possible that, however much *afterward* we would willingly say "Yes" to God, our conditions cannot change, and we must suffer crosses our rebellion imposed upon us. Many illustrations might be used to show the workings of this principle. God cannot prevent many of the evil consequences of disobedience to his known will.

Millions, had they only been in the will of God, might have joy instead of sorrow, pleasure instead of pain, life instead of death; *and these experiences, with any regrets accompanying them, must continue as long as the laws governing them exist.* An unhappy marriage must continue until death separates the parties, or worse evils would exist, unless grace refines and unites the two natures. Wrong business relations

may cost a man poverty all his days, and his family irreparable earthly losses ; but God can give grace so there shall be complete conformity to his will under such circumstances. *His will might have been obeyed, and the circumstances avoided.*

A change of attitude on our part must change God's special providential conduct toward us ; as surely as he can especially interfere in our behalf, when we are in his will, and need his immediate providential care. *That our conduct does not necessitate a change in God's conduct toward us, is a doctrine all the history and teaching of the Bible contradict.* His *purposes* are as unchanging as his nature ; but *if we will not, he cannot fulfil his purpose.* As his purposes can only be good, to be in conformity to his will can only be for our good. And because he is Love, he sets up a cross between him and us until we yield to our highest good. To teach that our lives now, in sin and rebellion, are as he wants them to be, and that the world is now as he has planned it to be, is to make God fellowship the greatest enormities in wickedness. This whole world could be according to the will of God, if men would only conform to it. God deals with humanity from that standpoint, and man's sense of guilt grows out of such a possibility.

Could one prove that we cannot conform to the will of God inwardly, he would have to admit that whatever we *cannot* conform to in God's will is under the

law of necessity, and ceases to be a matter of responsibility—therefore, of demerit. If a matter of choice, then it is possible now to inwardly conform to God's will. *To do so ends all inward crosses.* This act implies a perfect faith.

When one yields fully to the perfect will of God, all distrust is gone, and all the questioning of his providence and love. Many inward crosses have arisen from these sources. When the soul has fully yielded up to the will of God, the only question left is to know what that will is, and to do it at any cost.

*Outward crosses cannot end that way.* The more perfectly one conforms to God's will within, the more crosses exist outside; but they differ from the crosses that result from one's own disobedience: they involve no sense of responsibility for their existence, or are fruits of our former disobedience, the guilt of which has been removed, though regret remains.

One of the crosses we must always bear as long as unbelief remains is, that the most blessed spiritual realities that we wish to impart to those we most love, will not be believed or accredited. There is no agony more intense, no cross harder to be borne, than to be rejected when we are bearing good to others. Jesus suffered from this cross, and it made him weep, so deep was his sorrow of heart. This cross is intensified when, for bearing lovingly the truth, your "own" turn and rend you. How many a person has found no

cross in the home, until he rose to the spiritual life his friends approved of, who has found thorns all the way at home because he sought for them the same blessed experience. Jesus understood what he meant when he said, "A man's foes shall be they of his own household." Jealousies, anger, and enmities exist when one gives Jesus the first place in the heart, that were undeveloped before, and are wholly unsought. Natural love sometimes has to be made subservient to divine love ; this implies a cross to be borne. Choice frequently has to be made against the course our loved ones pursue. Sometimes they cruelly persecute us, and seek to divert our love ; frequently they betray us. Many of these betrayals are among professed Christians, some in the ranks of holiness people, who impugn our motives, and charge us falsely. Our fire and zeal are called "self-seeking." The popularity of success is called "lack of thoroughness;" our positive faith, "lack of conservatism;" and our immunity from undue ecclesiasticism, "lawlessness." Human laws are enacted, contradicting divine claims, and because we say, "We must obey God rather than man," we are called "schismatics." All these are crosses that must exist as long as wrong exists.

Each advanced stage of spiritual life produces its peculiar crosses ; and one of the crosses to be borne is the judgment of those who are exempt from *our* crosses, because they are not in the same state spiritu-

ally. This would look like begging the question, or an undue claim to sanctity, if those who judge, had not many of them later on, passed through the same judgment. *No advanced leader in furthering man's interests has ever escaped this cross*, though the next century did him honor. Jesus said, "In me ye shall have peace: in the world ye shall have tribulation." As he drew nearer to his cross many followed him no more, because of his "hard sayings." Even Peter, to whom shortly before, a revelation of his true nature had been made, protested against his bearing his cross, and going forward to reveal the truth. Insensibility to the consequences of being loyal to Christ, is a proof that such sensibilities are not under the refining influence of the Spirit of Christ. *There is a vast difference between cross-bearing and self-torture*. To be insensible to the taunt and rebuke may develop stoicism, but not fellowship with Christ's sufferings. To intentionally act to arouse opposition, with indifference to the treatment our conduct deserves, is one thing; and suffering for righteousness' sake quite another. To rebuke wrong in such a way as to arouse resistance, is one thing, and to rebuke it so, though resistance is aroused, you have done it in love, and the interests of the individual, is another.

When others demand we should live for self, or them, in such a way as to run counter to God, our answer is not that we are afraid to disobey God, but



that such a life cannot answer permanently the cravings of our inner nature, and the separation required is borne in view of having our nature satisfied at an unfailing Source. We do not covet the cross, and would avoid it, but accept it, and with it the loss of all things, to gain Christ. Jesus in doing his Father's will brought down on his head great persecution. His life was one continuous cross from the time he declared his messages to unrighteous men. He loved the race, and would have told them different than his messages declared, if they could have been saved without it; but in doing so with the purest of love, he aroused opposition unto death. To be mistreated for wrong-doing, one feels a sense of justice in it; but to be filled with love, and seeking one's good, and then to have such an one use every conceivable means of suffering that their evil hearts can invent, is a cross that goodness has had to suffer in the presence of sinful hearts, since Jesus was crucified; and such will be our crosses in proportion to our contact with sin, and the character of the sinner.

If we follow Jesus, do as he did, and live as he lived, we will find enough crosses to suffer *for his name's sake*. This, no doubt, is the reason why many shrink and falter by the way, and this is the reason why millions will never wear stars in their crown.

The cross is not greater than his grace, and if we

would only choose it, what glory would fill our souls !  
Let us be “faithful *unto* [not until] death,” and we  
shall have a glorious crown.

“ Must Jesus bear the cross alone,  
And all the world go free?  
No, there’s a cross for every one,  
And there’s a cross for me.”

## XIX.

## THE SELF LIFE.

A VERY misleading error has recently manifested itself in some quarters by the holiness people, called "the third blessing." It has not a single thinker for its leader worthy of recognition. Terms are confounded, and ideas advanced, that no reasonable person would for a moment accept. The main position is that, subsequent to entire sanctification, there is a death to self, with *some*, caused by "fire;" with *others*, a gradual process, by which we pass through the tests of our consecration and die in reality to what we yielded ourselves to in making our consecration. This last form is more subtle than the first. The "baptism with fire" that some teach follows the "baptism with the Holy Ghost," is simply based on the play of the conjunction "and" in the text, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost *and with fire.*" The theory is the legitimate result of many of our holiness teachers using the flimsiest arguments to establish this doctrine, when it stands out boldly for itself without any props or guesses to make it clear. I have frequently heard the conjunction "and"

dwelt upon for nearly a whole service, to prove that the experience of holiness was something different from the experience stated in the preceding words of the text. It is true a few such cases occur, but they are not the texts we depend upon to establish the Scripturalness of the doctrine of holiness. "First" and "Second" have been run to the same extreme, and a craze seems to have struck us of finding, in exceedingly out-of-the-way places, proofs of our distinctive doctrines. Ultimately this will all react upon us, as it has already in this "third blessing" of *fire*.

The other view, advocated by some better fitted to speak, is more subtle, but none the less dangerous. It has changed its form in recent years. When it received its first prominence, it was advocated that after we are sanctified wholly, we died out to all passions and appetites, and that the natural uses of the married estate ceased, and many other vagaries. This was promptly met; and though it sustained a paper, and had some following, is heard of but very little now. There *seems* to be quite a reasonableness about this finer theory. That we pass through an experience we cannot conceive when we are consecrating ourselves wholly to God for entire sanctification, at the time our consecration is tested, no one can doubt; but that this is a death to self, we deny. Because the element of suffering enters into that

experience, it is no proof that it is the struggles of a destructible self, in the last throes of death. This whole doctrine is an offshoot of the idea that a real *being* must undergo the process of a real death, and as it does not occur in entire sanctification, a place must be provided for it to occur. *But it never occurs ; so there is not any place for it.*

To end the sin-life ends all that can undergo a process of death, except the death of the body as a sacrifice—and there is no “deeper crucifixion,” while we are applying the tests of our consecration. *If not, What is there that suggests this idea?* We at once admit, to say “I’ll go every step of the way,” and “where he leads I will follow,” is one thing, and to do it, another. The mind is incapable of grasping all those words imply, though it may have portrayed before it visions of tests never to be borne, or but little idea of what is awaiting one. Sufficient *test* is put to secure what consecration is designed to accomplish; namely, *an unconditional commitment of one's self to all the will of God forever, as he may make it known.* When this consecration is made, and faith is complete, sin from that moment ceases, the divine part is accomplished, and the *being* is now free from everything that has the element of sin in it. Because later on, when the tests of consecration come to us, we must suffer many things, and pass through experiences our natures recoil from, as we co-work with

God in accomplishing his will, it is no proof that we are not dead to everything but God, or that we can die to self in any deeper sense than we did in our consecration. It is our sanctified, holy self that is steadily holding us, as a sacrifice (living) in obedience to all the will of God. *Two distinct wills forever remain, at the end of the completest process of salvation, and two distinct natures.* A self, distinctly human, and a not-self, The Divine One, united by mutual love, remain forever. This *human nature*, redeemed, purified, dead to sin, and yielded in consecration to God, under its own laws, shrinks from the sufferings, crosses, losses, etc., that co-operation with God demands. The shrinking and suffering is not because *sin* is setting up any antagonisms, or is moving on us to withhold anything from God; but the very constitution under which he made us, is the cause of our shrinking and suffering, and the more perfectly it is from under the pollution of sin, and dead to it, the more keenly it suffers. Instead of self dying, this is self at its best, living the real self that never dies, that cannot die.

The union with the other self is *voluntary*. God in his divine nature, communicative and loving, refers to the only death possible to such a being, the death of the body as a sacrifice in doing his will. All the suffering in spirit is for his sake, and is a means by which a pure nature enters into fellowship with God's

sufferings for a lost world. Instead of this being a death, it is the very life of a soul in God. The surrender of ourselves to God where his will demands a human sacrifice is a yielding of ourselves *against the natural law of OUR being, to the higher law of HIS being*. Consecration implies this, and faith accepts it. The revelation of the will of God to a truly sanctified soul may set up questions pertaining to that will, and its relation to us, but never demands a death because of any unwillingness to acquiesce in it, though before unrevealed. The truly sanctified soul, makes no discovery of unwillingness to conform to the will of God, when that will is known, for sanctification implies that state of being, and faith could not otherwise be perfect. Perfect faith is essential to perfect cleansing. To put a soul through a death process, subsequent to sanctification, implies that some vitality exists that resists the tests God's will sends. This vitality could only be sin, for in normal human nature there is nothing opposed to the will of God. The word *death*, as a matter of inner experience, is outlawed after entire sanctification. Many of these theories would have no existence, if the work of entire sanctification was more genuine in many who profess it.

The doctrine of death to self, subsequent to entire sanctification, like the one of a gradual death to self *for* sanctification, springs from the same root, namely, *that there is not any complete death to self as a finished*

*act.* *Self-knowledge* is our sure defence against such theories. If we cannot depend upon what we know, we have no ground for reason whatever. We are capable of knowing ourselves in distinction from every other self or thing. Mankind has never known another being, possessing the attributes of being, full of sin, he called himself, or an essential part of himself. The consciousness of the *unity* of his person excludes such a thing. He also knows that sin is not *himself*, nor any *other self*, and yet because it is manifested in him, it is called "the man of sin." He never thinks of a death in which *he* will cease to be; *he cannot think such a thing*, but he clearly sees that an *impersonal self* can cease to be, and this is the only thing of which a death can be predicated outside the death of the body. He is also conscious that another self may communicate with himself, the basis of that communication being something in common in nature. In the final argument man must fall back on his own consciousness, and if his consciousness attests realities that no other human consciousness can witness to, he must believe his selfhood. When others add their testimony to the existence of the same realities and states of experience, the proof is well nigh irresistible. In God there are realities of which we can never be conscious. Alone throughout eternity he must remain the sole possessor of them. He is the fountain from whence all our good



and perfect realities come ; but he can communicate them to us, and make himself known in so doing, so plainly known, that we do not mistake him for ourselves, or any other self ; and *what* he makes known can be as clearly revealed, as that He is making it known.

Now, if God witness to a death to self in entire sanctification, it cannot be a divine process subsequent to it. Thousands of the most reliable witnesses testify to a divinely attested death to self in sanctification, while the death to self of the gradualists, or those who reach a dying out under individual tests, is never consummated or witnessed to. *Again*, if there is a death to an abnormal self subsequent to holiness, *then an abnormal state can be a perfect one, which is an absurdity.* If there is a death to a normal state it can only be sacrificially, as when Christ gave himself for us ; but this must be kept in view : *in sacrifice everything is saved.* “He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.” *In death to self a removal is necessary to save everything savable.*

Brethren, beloved, we have reached the period when we must have less of the speculative and more of the practical ; less theory, more truth. In the last twenty years a dozen new things have arisen to detract from the one thing, namely, HOLINESS. To emphasize by ministry, testimony, or song anything else, and give it a more vital place in our thought or affec-

tions is to pervert the truth. Holiness relates to a permanent state of being : to spiritual harmony with the nature of God here, and hereafter. Outside of God himself, no other realities can comprehend as much, as being in a state of holiness implies. The personal appearance of Jesus Christ cannot impart any nature ; to be permanent, Christ must be "*formed within.*" Holiness as a state will remain unchanged after the soul possessing it has passed through countless changes, "from glory to glory" It is the one thing that here, and now, can become a finality, and about which we may have perfect rest. When Jesus will appear on earth to gather his saints, may be a question of uncertainty until he comes : but that he has come to our hearts as a permanent guest can be an experience of indescribable joy. Never to go out to take on another appearance. The Jesus coming in the clouds of glory will only be "an appearing" of the Christ who has entered the purified heart for an eternal abiding place. The Spirit can only be seen by the spiritual. A look at the glorified Christ will be satisfying, only as we have been changed into his image. To expect to see, with our sense faculty, anything that ever can be seen of Christ that will satisfy the demands of our spirit nature, is to make the lesser comprehend the greater. All figures fail, all forms break down, imagery falls beneath, tongue cannot express, nor symbols represent what the Spirit

works into the spirit nature of man, when he makes him holy. Healing for the body is grand, but is not resurrection power, as it will be when there is no more death. Reigning over kingdoms is only an imitation of the sublimity and glory of God's own reign in the invisible realm of his spiritual kingdom. Holiness takes our eyes off the seen, and centres them upon the unseen. It has no tabernacle, for the tabernacle of God is with men. Beloved! Beloved!! Beloved!!! let us keep to this centre. Don't urge or seek death to self to replace a lost sanctification; such a formula will never restore the lost grace. Don't seek some gift to *do* something, but some gift to *be* some one. "Lo here's!" may attract you, but an indwelling Christ will satisfy you. Not other blessings, but a *state of blessedness* is what we need. Not a deeper death, but a larger life; not shrinking from sacrifice because it means a deeper death to self, but a greater lostness to the seen, and a fuller knowledge of the fountains welling up from the heart of God, in the unseen and eternal.

## XX.

### WHAT I KNOW ABOUT IT PERSONALLY

If a man sets out to write a book, let him put down only what he knows. have guesses enough of my own. — GOETHE.

To discriminate between certainty and knowledge demands an experience. Much that is called testimony lacks the essential thing, viz., *the knowledge of the reality*. They say I was born in New Ross, Wexford County, Ireland. I *know* I was born. I cannot vouch for the place; I saw the certificate of my birth, and my mother told me, with many others, that I was born at the above place. They said it was on March 25, 1853. I was brought up religiously, attending church and two Sabbath-schools regularly. I also attended social meetings, and the fear of God was before my eyes. My father, a Godly sea-captain, of Quaker stock, though in later years a Wesleyan Methodist, died in my ninth year, and was buried at sea. This made a very deep impression on my young heart, and I earnestly vowed I would lead a Godly life. My mother, who was a confirmed invalid after my birth, was a devout Christian. Her confinement by sickness threw us together much. It was at her

knee I learned first to read God's word. I can truthfully say, —

“ She led me first to God ; her words and prayers were my young spirit's dew.”

The shock of my father's death was more than she could bear, and in grace and much fortitude she continued until Jan. 13, 1864. Before her death she called me to her, and laying her hand on my head, gave me her parting blessing, and asked me to meet her in heaven. I promised I would, and was led by the memory of that hour to finally give God my heart. The sad event of her death changed my whole life. After some vicissitudes I came to America, and greeted my eldest brother for the first time, he having left home before I was born. Language cannot describe my feelings as I embraced him for the first time. I had seen his picture, read his letters, but now I saw his face. Like our Elder Brother, “whom having not seen we love,” who left for another country before we were born, and will give us a royal welcome when we get there.

Though I had my share of troubles and trials, incident to a boy's life, some quite severe, I tried to live a good life, but fell far short of it. I tended to fun, and was gifted with Irish wit ; I was much in demand for so-called innocent amusement, frequently in the church circles. The influence of my early training

was the only thing that saved me from a wicked life. I tried farming to build up a poor constitution, and laid the foundation for that rugged health which has continued for these twenty-eight years of hard service for the Master. My first and only Sabbath-breaking was commenced with a hunt. Before going far, I was so deeply convicted I sat under a tree and wept earnestly, promising God I would not do so any more. I have been able to keep that vow. My course would have been downward rapidly, had not a foundation been laid in the home, Sunday-school, and helpful environments. Naturally a leader, while amusing and mirth-provoking, I abhorred drunkenness, profanity, lewdness, and grosser forms of sin. The fear of the consequences of such a life deterred me from entering it; and yet I was a lost sinner.

In 1868 my whole life was changed. A gracious revival was being held in St. Mark's M. E. Church, Elk Street, Buffalo, N.Y. A Godly man, who has recently passed to his reward, visited our neighborhood, going from house to house, and invited me to attend the services. Fond of singing, I consented. His team of black horses was sent around the neighborhood to gather up the sleigh-loads. Already several were converted. I well remember one song, sung lustily:—

“O ye must be a lover of the Lord,  
Or you can't go to heaven when you die.”

One sitting by my side asked me if I was a Christian. I answered, "No." That simple question unlocked the chambers of my memory, and trains of thought, producing profound conviction, came into my mind. I wish I knew who spoke that word.

"A nameless man, amid a crowd that thronged the daily mart,  
Let fall a word of hope and love, unstudied from his heart;  
A whisper on the tumult thrown, a transitory breath,  
It raised a brother from the dust, it saved a soul from death.  
O germ! O fount! O word of love! O thought at random cast!  
Ye were but little at the first, but mighty at the last."

The memories of former days, my mother's blessing, her unanswered prayer, my unfulfilled promises, all aroused me. The thought of being lost seemed unbearable. I responded to the invitation to seek Christ, and presented myself at the altar. I was a repentant sinner. I needed a Saviour. While nearing home I found him, and spent the most of the night in praise. All sense of guilt disappeared; my heart was lit up with glory. I had a clear witness my sins were forgiven, and that I was a child of God. The Bible was a new book, the cross had new beauty, the Saviour was real — *he was my Saviour*. The means of grace were a pleasure. I soon found myself conducting cottage prayer-meetings. I was happy, cheerful, earnest.

I was clearly called to preach from my early youth, but did not regard it as from God until my conver-

sion. For four years I lived the *mixed life* of the average Christian, frequently intensely religious, and then full of worldly loves and desires. My besetment was my fun-making, and what came of it. I would have seasons of bitter repentings and renewals. I decided to go West, and turned my thoughts to business. I soon learned neither happiness nor safety could be hoped for outside the line of duty. In business there was failure, in body sickness, in mind unrest, in heart God's disapproval. Four years had passed since my happy conversion. Blessed seasons, lost moments, worldly aspirations conflicting with a call to preach, a keen sense of unfitness, all were struggling within me. I decided on one thing, — whether I do business or preach, I will be a Christian. I was graciously renewed, enjoyed spiritual services, and was pleasing to God.

It was at that time I heard the first definite sermon preached on Holiness. I was at once convicted that I ought to possess it. An intense conviction seized me. "Woe is me, if I preach not the gospel." I will never forget that memorable night when this crisis came in my life. Only those who go through the testing of a real consecration know what it means to say, I will say "Yes" to the will of God forever. When all was yielded up, and I could trust everything to God forever, I claimed the blessing. Oh, the peace! the light! the love! that entered my heart;



a real heaven of love. Rest indescribable. I had no to-morrow. Each day seemed complete in itself. I seemed to be under some loving rule that made me measure up fully to my convictions. My trust was complete, childlike. There was no fear, neither restraint. I told my experience *because I wanted to* whether it was rejected or believed. One word describes it; viz., *Perfect Love*.

Rev. A. B. Earle was in the neighborhood, urging his Baptist friends to accept this same experience under the term of "The Rest of Faith." I sat at his feet ten days, and feasted, being confirmed in the experience. I was licensed to exhort, to preach, and soon entered the ranks of the regular ministry, and have ever since been publicly ministering in the things of the Lord with success. Many things well worth recording of God's dealings, for which I have not space, aided me in my work and experience. I at once became a soul-winner, and have seen tens of thousands converted, reclaimed, and sanctified wholly, up to this time. To God be all the glory! Marriage with its joys, death with its sorrows, have sweetened and saddened my lot, only to find that in both "all things work together for good to them that love God." In the pastorate, as an evangelist, in travels much on both continents, I have found Jesus an all-sufficient Saviour.

I owe it to the cause that lies nearest my heart

as I write these lines to say, I have not through these twenty-six years retained unbroken the experience of holiness. I have had some lapses, *though my outer life to the church and world has not shown it*. Through quite extended periods, what I teach in these pages concerning holiness *has been my glorious experience*. The cause of truth can suffer nothing, when I say I have been just as conscious of its absence during those short lapses that have intervened. As I finish this volume, the statements of which I cannot recall, after they have gone forth to be read by the many, I want to say, I have a clear evidence that the blood of Jesus Christ *now* cleanseth *me* from all sin, and I find an indescribable longing to forever maintain this experience at any cost, *and never dishonor* the cause I in some humble way represent. My only hope that I shall succeed is grounded in Jesus Christ as an Almighty Saviour. A growing conviction seizes me that a great holiness revival is at hand, and an unprecedented anointing, leading to suffering, sacrifice, service, and victory as never before. Beloved, let us rise to the possibilities of the hour. The times call for holy men. Jesus is calling for brave, strong men, who live what they preach, and preach what they believe. For myself, I cannot linger in the past. It is covered with the blood. I cannot spend my present in gloating over victories won, or sadly regretting what has been lost beyond recall. A new era

is coming! A new day dawneth! Up! let us be doing. Onward! the cry. The truth shall triumph; and when we meet again, writer and reader, may the few truths poorly portrayed in these pages be but a ray to the full-orbed sun that shall shine upon us from Him who is the Truth himself. I know he pardons. I know he regenerates. I know he sanctifies. I know he keeps. I "know *whom* I have believed." *My Watchword*, Victory! Victory!! Victory!!!

